

SOCIOLOGY AND THE STUDY OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

BY

L. L. BERNARD, Ph.D.

PROFESSOR OF SOCIOLOGY—WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

AND

JESSIE BERNARD, M.A.



WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY STUDIES—NEW SERIES
SOCIAL AND PHILOSOPHICAL SCIENCES—No. 4
ST. LOUIS, 1934

PREFACE

THIS study was begun early in 1930 in response to a request of Professor Joseph P. Chamberlain of Columbia University, Chairman of the Special Committee on International Relations of the Social Science Research Council, Inc. The results of this early study were published in mimeograph for the use of Professor Chamberlain's committee. For the purposes of the present publication the material has been thoroughly reworked and brought up to date, new chapters added, old chapters modified, the material content greatly expanded, and the orientation so restated as to render it suitable for the present purposes.

The purpose of this monograph is two-fold. In the first place, we have desired to make clear the very considerable contributions the sociologists—working always from their own point of view, of course—have made to the study of international relations and closely cognate aspects of the social sciences. Our second object has been to present a sort of digest of the positions taken by the sociologists with reference to international relations. The topics covered are obviously incomplete, owing to limitations of space, but those here presented may be regarded as fairly representative of the work being done.

It has not been possible always to separate rigorously the work of the sociologists from that of other social scientists in the fields here discussed and at the same time preserve the unity of the subjects treated. The reader will, however, experience no difficulty in distinguishing the contributions of the sociologists from other contributions, if he finds it desirable to make such a distinction. The predominance of work of the sociologists in the fields here portrayed is easily discernible. Also, it has seemed to us to be necessary to include with the sociological treatment of international relations an analysis of the sociological discussions of themes immediately supple-

mentary thereto. Otherwise it would not have been possible to render the presentation of the more restricted theme sufficiently clear. Finally, we regret that space does not permit of a fuller treatment of the subject, but we trust that the present analysis will meet in a degree not wholly inadequate the immediate needs of students of the subject-matter treated.

L. L. BERNARD,
JESSIE BERNARD.

Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.
October 4, 1933.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE	3
CHAPTER I. SOCIOLOGICAL RELATIONS AND METHODS	7
CHAPTER II. RECENT RESEARCH IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS BY AMERICAN SOCIOLOGISTS	13
CHAPTER III. IMMIGRATION AND ASSIMILATION	33
CHAPTER IV. THE SOCIOLOGY OF WAR AND IMPERIALISM	41
CHAPTER V. PEACE AND PEACEFUL RELATIONS	57
CHAPTER VI. SOCIOLOGICAL CONCEPTS, VIEWPOINTS, AND INTERPRETATIONS OF VALUE FOR THE STUDY OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS	71
CHAPTER VII. SOCIOLOGY COURSES IN THE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES DEALING WITH SUBJECT-MATTER OF SPECIFIC SIGNIFICANCE FOR THE STUDY OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS	87
CHAPTER VIII. POSSIBLE CONTRIBUTIONS OF SOCIOLOGY TO COOPERATIVE INVESTIGATION IN THE FIELD OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS	91
CHAPTER IX. SUMMARY OF THE RELATIONS OF SOCIOLOGY TO THE OTHER SOCIAL SCIENCE DISCIPLINES IN THE STUDY OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS	105
INDEX	111

CHAPTER I

SOCIOLOGICAL RELATIONS AND METHODS

SOCIOLOGY first became integrated as a separate social science in the colleges and universities in the eighteen-eighties. It was then in a peculiar sense a synthetic discipline, having been derived from a number of antecedent disciplines, such as the theory of Natural Law, the philosophy of history, moral philosophy, classical and Hebrew antiquities, Social Science,¹ institutional history, and various social problems not specifically economic or political in character, such as criminology and penology, charities, social problems of education, immigration, race problems, labor problems, etc., all of which had in the recently preceding decades gained access to academic curricula.² The immediate significance of this fact is (1) that sociology split off from antecedent social science disciplines much later than political science (especially international law) and economics, and therefore has been later in the process of integrating a distinctive subject-matter. However, the fact that its existence as a separate discipline was due largely to the demand for a more synthetic viewpoint which would look upon social facts and relationships from a standpoint that might be called, for want of a better term, that of "social value," as over against the narrower outlook of the market value or economic

¹ This subject seems first to have entered the academic curricula at Oberlin College in 1858, at Williams College (Professor A. L. Perry, teacher) in 1865, and at the University of Pennsylvania (Robert Ellis Thompson, teacher) in 1868. Professor Thompson appears to have offered the first wholly independent course, uncombined with political science or political economy.

² See *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*, I: 324-349; Bernard, L. L., "Some Historical and Recent Trends of Sociology in the United States," *Southwestern Polit. and Soc. Sci. Quart.*, IX: 264-293 (Dec., 1928); Lundberg, G. A. (ed.), *Trends in American Sociology*, Ch. I, 1929; Gee, Wilson (ed.), *Research Barriers in the South*, Ch. II, 1932 ("An Historical Perspective," by L. L. Bernard); Bernard, L. L. and Jessie, *Report on Sociology and the Study of International Relations*, published in mimeograph by Institute for Research in Social Science, Chapel Hill, N. C., 1930; "Sociology," *American Year Book*, 1931, pp. 790-794; 1932, pp. 803-809.

value of political economy, or the formal legalistic norms of jurisprudence, and the highly institutionalized theories of rights, obligations, sovereignty, etc., of political science, guaranteed to sociology from the beginning a quasi-separateness of subject-matter arising out of its method of logical treatment of such subjects as it inherited from the older disciplines. Besides these borrowed subjects, it of course had a considerable body of material not covered adequately or at all by the other social science disciplines as then constituted.

(2) Sociology has been achieving gradually greater separateness as a social science discipline. This tendency toward distinctness of sociology from the older social science disciplines has, however, been in considerable degree checked, and in some degree nullified, by the recent movement toward a closer rapprochement among the social sciences, due to no inconsiderable extent to the influence of sociology in presenting its more functional and socially inclusive viewpoint to the other social sciences. Thus it has had much to do with the growth of the approach to economic science made by Institutional Economics under the leadership of Veblen,³ Hamilton,⁴ Patten,⁵ and others, and of Welfare Economics as set forth by Hobson,⁶ Tawney,⁷ Douglas,⁸ Pigou,⁹ and others; the emphasis

³ Veblen, T. B., *Theory of Business Enterprise*, 1904; *Imperial Germany and the Industrial Revolution*, 1915; *The Nature of Peace and the Terms of Its Perpetuation*, 1917; *The Engineers and the Price System*, 1921; *Absentee Ownership and Business Enterprise in Recent Times*, 1923.

⁴ Hamilton, Walton H., *Current Economic Problems*, 1915; *Readings in the Economics of War*, 1918.

⁵ Patten, Simon N., *Theory of Dynamic Economics*, 1892; *Theory of Social Forces*, 1896; *Development of English Thought*, 1899; *Heredity and Social Progress*, 1903; *The New Basis of Civilization*, 1907; *The Social Basis of Religion*, 1911; *Culture and War*, 1916.

⁶ Hobson, John A., *Problems of Poverty*, 1896; *The Economics of Distribution*, 1900; *Imperialism*, 1902; *The Crisis of Liberalism*, 1909; *The Industrial System*, 1909; *The Social Problem*, 1909; *Work and Wealth*, 1914; *Problems of a New World*, 1921; etc.

⁷ Tawney, R. H., *Studies in the Minimum Wage*, 1914; *The Acquisitive Society*, 1920; *The British Labor Movement*, 1925, etc.

⁸ Douglas, Paul H., *The Worker in Modern Economic Society*, 1923; *Wages and the Family*, 1925; *The Problem of Unemployment*, 1931.

⁹ Pigou, A. C., *Principles and Methods of Industrial Peace*, 1905; *Wealth and Welfare*, 1912; *Unemployment*, 1914; *The Economics of Welfare*, 1920.

upon political parties, political psychology, contemporary political movements, etc., by Merriam,¹⁰ Beard,¹¹ Munro,¹² Holcombe,¹³ Lasswell,¹⁴ Kent,¹⁵ and others, upon social history by Shotwell,¹⁶ Robinson,¹⁷ Beard,¹⁸ Barnes,¹⁹ and others; upon sociological jurisprudence by Pound²⁰ and others, and other similar trends in the social sciences. These newer and more inclusive "sociological" trends in the other social sciences perhaps are not so much the product of sociology as they are of the necessity of a more functional and less institutionalized and less formal viewpoint, of which sociology as a discipline was the first outstanding product. In fact, it may possibly be said that sociology appeared upon the scene as a separate discipline largely (not wholly) because the older social sciences at first resisted the demand of a more complex and completely interlocking world of social phenomena for a more synthetic and flexibly functional treatment, which sociology provided by a species of revolt, or, perhaps more accurately, by a migration to new chairs and departments. However this may be, the viewpoint at first recognized by sociology is now rapidly becoming the viewpoint of important "schools" or "trends" in each of the other social sciences, and this fact of itself is bringing sociology closer in method, and also in subject-matter, to the other social sciences rather than differentiating it further from them.

Because also of the change of method of all the social sciences

¹⁰ Merriam, C. E., *New Aspects of Politics*, 1925.

¹¹ Beard, Chas. A., *Economic Interpretation of the Constitution*, 1913; *Economic Origins of Jeffersonian Democracy*, 1915; *Economic Basis of Politics*, 1922; *The American Leviathan*, 1930.

¹² Munro, W. B., *Personality in Politics*, 1924; *The Invisible Government*, 1927.

¹³ Holcombe, A. N., *Foundations of the Modern Commonwealth*, 1923.

¹⁴ Lasswell, H. D., *Propaganda Technique in the World War*, 1927.

¹⁵ Kent, F. B., *The Great Game of Politics*, 1923; *Political Behavior*, 1928.

¹⁶ Shotwell, J. T., *The Religious Revolution of Today*, 1913.

¹⁷ Robinson, J. H., *The New History*, 1911; *The Ordeal of Civilization*, 1926.

¹⁸ Beard, C. A., *Rise of American Civilization*, 1927.

¹⁹ Barnes, H. E., *History and Social Intelligence*, 1926; *The Twilight of Christianity*, 1929; etc., etc.

²⁰ Pound, Roscoe, *Introduction to the Philosophy of Law*, 1922; *Law and Morals*, 1924.

from a logically deductive attack upon their problems to a relatively pure type of induction, in which hypotheses no longer have the restrictive force of major premises, but are mere tentative perspectives upon phenomena which easily and willingly respond to modification with the discovery and integration of new data, the rather definite early territorialization of these social sciences is breaking down. Social facts are quite without territoriality or rights of jurisdiction as between the social sciences, and the only separateness of the social sciences now recognized by the newer inductive workers (barring of course those purely artificial distinctions perpetuated by administrative divisions, endowments, research grants, national and local associations, etc.) is that imposed upon them by the distinctiveness of their problems and ultimate social aims.

As a result of this trend toward the elimination of inviolable boundaries between the social sciences, the chief distinctions are coming to be between the men working at different problems and the problems or fields occupied by researchers rather than between academic departments or abstract and theoretical divisions characterized as separate disciplines. In recent years this overlapping of fields has grown to such an extent that several new social sciences of decided importance have arisen between formerly distinctly separate fields. Thus, to speak of that phase of social science known best to the writers of this report, social psychology has arisen with its roots in both sociology and psychology; educational sociology, with a similar relation to both education and sociology; social anthropology, social legislation, juridical sociology or sociological jurisprudence, social history, social economy, social politics, social biology, etc., all of which have been built upon two or more older social or other sciences. In some cases, as in that of social psychology, the new hybrid derivative social science has at least as much methodological (if not academic) importance as the older parent social sciences themselves.

Accordingly, in this study the primary emphasis will not be upon the contributions of sociology as a separate and distinct social science to another separate and distinct social science, that of international relations, but rather upon what sociology as one of several related social sciences is able to contribute, or has contributed, to a highly synthetic discipline—international relations—which has grown up out of the other social sciences (not merely out of international law) and has its roots strongly imbedded in all of them. In fact, it is our conviction that as the subject of international relations is able to integrate and to define itself more adequately with respect to the phenomena of the international relations and interests to which it will be called upon to give logical classification and academic organization, it will draw increasingly upon sociology and its derivatives, and especially upon social psychology.

In general, sociology still overlaps at many points with the other social sciences, either because of an incomplete differentiation from them or because of a growing coalescence with them. This is less true with respect to the subject of international relations than most other social science subjects, for historically sociology has never dealt extensively with international problems as such. It is, however, now beginning to enter that field with its own particular viewpoints and interests. European sociology, especially in the writings of Letourneau, Novicow, Stein, Ratzenhofer, Le Bon, and Gumplowicz, has been more concerned with international relations than has American sociology. The chief contributions of sociology to the field of international relations in this country have perhaps been through points of view and analyses developed primarily in national and local group analysis, which are now beginning to be applied by sociologists and by the other branches of social science, including the field of international relations, to the subject of international contacts. In the following pages the various types of contributions to the study of international relations by sociology will be outlined as adequately as has

been found possible within the limited space at our disposal. On the whole, it appears to be a very considerable contribution. The present study is necessarily incomplete and schematic, owing to the fact that it must appear within the limitations of the bulletin form.

CHAPTER II

RECENT RESEARCH IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS BY AMERICAN SOCIOLOGISTS

SOCIOLOGY has been primarily a teaching subject, nearly always badly undermanned in the colleges and universities, and frequently, if not generally (especially in the smaller institutions) taught by some one whose major interest has been in another social science or in education, philosophy, or psychology. Investigation has shown that in some cases it has been taught by teachers whose primary interests were in mathematics or in the biological sciences. As a consequence, research in sociology has been confined chiefly to a few institutions, such as Columbia, Chicago, Wisconsin, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Minnesota, and Southern California, where there were sufficiently large faculties to permit of adequate specialization, a considerable number of graduate students to permit of participation, and frequently teachers of sufficient drive and energy to enable them to engage in research in addition to carrying their heavy teaching loads. In recent years the allotment of research funds to some of these institutions by the Social Science Research Council and other research patrons in the social sciences has greatly stimulated research in sociology. Another cause perhaps for the somewhat tardy and slow development of research in sociology has been the largely synthetic character of sociology. It has been going through a period of integration and consolidation. Since it had to draw many of its materials from diverse sources, while it was developing others from fields or subjects generally recognized as its own (such as the family, criminology, poverty and relief, rural sociology, urban sociology, social psychology, immigration, etc.), it has found it necessary to organize these materials from both types of sources into a logically constructed academic discipline. This work of synthesis is about finished, and

sociology has been for some time (in some institutions for a longer period than in others) engaged in intensive research within the limits of its own characteristic subject-matter. These researches have been, however, for the most part concerned with local and national problems and with the general field of behavior and adjustment, rather than with international problems and relations, as will be indicated later when the indirect contributions of sociology to the study of international relations are discussed.

The causes of this limitation of field are various. Perhaps the chief factor is that sociology has made a very conscious effort not to overlap unduly with other well integrated subjects, and the old international law and history, the two subjects which previously covered international relations especially, were already well integrated when sociology became a university subject. Also, until recently, international relations were treated almost exclusively from formal or legalistic and historical viewpoints, while the approach of sociology has always been primarily from the functionally analytical standpoint. It was also strongly impressed upon the sociologists, both by their own colleagues and by their outside critics, that they should stick closely to earth, i. e., to the things in their immediate environments. Sociology has not been, except in the fields of cultural anthropology and the history of social theory, and latterly in a special aspect of social psychology, particularly concerned with documentary materials. It has been one of the most persistent among the social sciences in adhering to the interpretation of contemporaneous data and in devising methods for collecting and generalizing these data. It is worthy of note in this connection that perhaps more works on methodology, and particularly on the collection of data, have been written in recent years by sociologists than by members of any other branch of the social sciences. This fact evidences a recent great interest in research by sociologists, and it also explains in large measure why they have so largely confined

their efforts to local problems on the one hand, and to problems dealing with behavior on the other.

As might be supposed, the investigations by sociologists bearing upon international relations have taken on a different incidence from those undertaken by students of international law and other social sciences. Also they may be divided into two general classes: those that bear directly upon international relations, and those that bear indirectly upon this subject. The two classes are united by many examples that fall between and are therefore not always easily distinguished, but the advantages of such a distinction are numerous and it will be attempted here. First, let us consider briefly some of those studies that bear indirectly upon international relations.

Several American sociologists have been interested in the investigation of the traits and general culture of other peoples. This has been particularly true of the work of Sumner and Keller,¹ and of the Yale school of sociology in general, of A. J. Todd,² and of W. I. Thomas.³ E. A. Ross, using the observational method and checking his observations carefully against the opinions and data of leading scholars, journalists, and officials of the countries studied, has written books dealing with Latin America,⁴ Mexico,⁵ Russia,⁶ and China.⁷ Ross carried on his studies in Russia at the instigation and under the patronage of the American Institute for Social Service. Robert E. Park⁸ and U. G. Weatherly⁹ have both made first-hand investigations of social, economic, political, and religious conditions and attitudes in the West Indies, including the

¹ *The Science of Society*, 4 vols., 1927-1928.

² *The Primitive Family as an Educational Agency*, 1918.

³ *The Polish Peasant*, 5 vols., 1918-1921.

⁴ *South of Panama*, 1914.

⁵ *The Social Revolution in Mexico*, 1923.

⁶ *Russia in Upheaval*, 1918; *The Russian Bolshevik Revolution*, 1921; *Soviet Republic*, 1928.

⁷ *The Changing Chinese*, 1911.

⁸ "Magic, Mentality, and City Life," *Pub. Amer. Sociol. Soc.*, XVIII: 102-115 (1924).

⁹ Weatherly, U. G., "Culture Contacts in the West Indies," *Pub. Amer. Sociol. Soc.*, XXI: 201-204 (1927); "Haiti: An Experiment in Pragmatism," *Amer. J. Sociol.*, XXXII: 353-366 (Nov., 1926).

islands of Trinidad, Jamaica, and Haiti, among others. Ross prepared a report¹⁰ for the League of Nations. Dr. John Stewart Burgess has made investigations of institutional life in China.¹¹ Maurice T. Price has also made some studies of Chinese life and institutions.¹² Robert E. Park has recently undertaken studies of conditions in the Pacific and in Eastern Asia.¹³ William F. Ogburn has made investigations of economic and social conditions in France.¹⁴ C. R. Henderson¹⁵ and J. L. Gillin¹⁶ have made rather searching studies of penal and correctional procedures in foreign countries. William C. Smith has studied institutional life in Assam¹⁷ and more recently the assimilation process in Hawaii. Romanzo Adams of the University of Hawaii has conducted extensive studies of immigrant peoples and of the natives in those islands. L. L. and J. S. Bernard have made a study of racial relations in Latin America.¹⁸ Several of our sociologists, including Theodore Abel,¹⁹ Louis Wirth,²⁰ Harry E. Barnes,²¹ C. A. Ellwood,²² Pauline V. Young,²³ P. A. Sorokin,²⁴ J. F. Hecker,²⁵ L. L. Ber-

¹⁰ *Report on Employment of Native Labor in Portuguese Africa*, 1925.

¹¹ "New Cycle of Cathay and America's Part in It," *Survey*, LVI: 183-185 (May 1, 1926); "Trends in Social Reconstruction in China," *Nat. Conf. Soc. Work*, 1929, pp. 45-64; "Shall America Feed China?" *Survey*, LXIII: 209-210 (Nov. 15, 1929); "Guilds and Trade Associations of China," *Annals Amer. Acad. Polit. and Soc. Sci.*, CLII: 72-80 (Nov., 1930); (with Stella Fisher Burgess), "The American Stake in China," *Survey*, LVIII: 35-38 (May 1, 1927).

¹² "Communist Policy and the Chinese Nationalist Revolution," *Annals Amer. Acad. Polit. and Soc. Sci.*, CLII: 229-240 (Nov., 1930); "Social Science Materials in Far Eastern Culture," *Amer. J. Sociol.*, XXXVII: 748-759 (Mar., 1932).

¹³ "Our Racial Frontier on the Pacific," *Survey*, LVI: 192-196 (May 1, 1926).

¹⁴ *The Economic Development of Post-War France*, 1929.

¹⁵ *Modern Prison Systems*, 1903.

¹⁶ *The Taming of the Criminal: Adventures in Penology*, 1931.

¹⁷ *The Ao Naga Tribes of Assam*, 1925.

¹⁸ "The Negro in Relation to Other Races in Latin America," *Annals Amer. Acad. Polit. and Soc. Sci.*, CXL: 306-318 (Nov., 1928).

¹⁹ *Systematic Sociology in Germany*, 1929.

²⁰ "The Sociology of Ferdinand Tönnies," *Amer. J. Sociol.*, XXXII: 412-422 (Nov., 1926); "Modern German Conceptions of Sociology," *Ibid.*, pp. 461-470.

²¹ "The Fate of Sociology in England," *Pub. Amer. Sociol. Soc.*, XXI: 26-46 (1927); *Sociology and Political Theory*, 1924.

²² "Sociology in Europe," *Sociol. and Soc. Research*, XIII: 203-210 (1928-1929).

²³ "Contemporary German Sociology," *Sociol. and Soc. Research*, XVI: 355-366 (Mar.-Apr., 1932).

²⁴ "Russian Sociology in the Twentieth Century," *Pub. Amer. Sociol. Soc.*, XXI: 57-69 (1927).

²⁵ *Russian Sociology*.

nard²⁶ and others, are studying the social sciences of other countries. For some years L. L. Bernard has published frequently in *Social Forces*, *The Southwestern Social Science Review*, *The Journal of Political Economy*, *The Saint Louis Law Review*, and other standard reviews of the United States, summaries of the most important social science literature produced in the Latin American countries. These are the completest surveys of their kind in English. Jerome Davis and associates have been interested especially in the study of Russian culture in recent years.²⁷ H. E. Barnes, as director of the Studies in American Imperialism of the Harmon Foundation, has had studies made of United States imperialistic activities in Cuba, Bolivia, and Santo Domingo.²⁸ Barnes has also studied the general social results of imperialism in detail.²⁹ Much work has also been done in the investigation of the methods and results of foreign missions. Maurice T. Price's evaluation of missionary work in the Orient³⁰ is an outstanding example of work in this field. C. C. Zimmerman has made an interesting analysis of the social situation in Siam.³¹ The various research founda-

²⁶ "The Development and Present Tendencies of Sociology in Argentina," *Social Forces*, VI: 13-27 (Sept., 1927).

²⁷ Davis, Jerome (ed.), *The Soviet Union Between the Two Five-Year Plans*, 1933; "Should America Quarantine the Russian Soviet Government?" *Annals Amer. Acad. Polit. and Soc. Sci.*, CXXVI: 117-125 (July, 1926); "One Hundred and Fifty Years of American-Russian Relations, 1777-1927," *Ibid.*, CXXXII: 18-81 (July, 1927); "Testing the Social Attitudes of Children in the Government Schools in Russia," *Amer. Jl. Sociol.*, XXXII: 947-952 (May, 1927); "The Russian People and the Soviets," *Nation*, CIX: 345-349 (Sept. 6, 1919); "A Sociological Interpretation of the Russian Revolution," *Polit. Sci. Quart.*, XXXVII: 227-250 (June, 1922); "The System of Government in Soviet Russia," *Current Hist.*, XXVII: 382-386 (Dec., 1927); "Soviet Russia in the Light of History," *Annals Amer. Acad. Polit. and Soc. Sci.*, CXXXVIII: 110-116 (July, 1928); "Critique of Russian Communism," *World Tomorrow*, XIII: 20-23 (Jan., 1930). See also Kingsbury, Susan M. and Fairchild, Mildred, "Everyday Russia," *Woman's Journal*, N. S., XVI: 8-10 (Jan., 1931); Woolston, Howard, "Propaganda in Soviet Russia," *Amer. Jl. Sociol.*, XXXVIII: 32-40 (July, 1932).

²⁸ Among the volumes in this series are Jenks, L. H., *Our Cuban Colony: A Study in Sugar*, 1928; Knight, M. M., *The Americans in Santo Domingo*, 1928; Marsh, Margaret A., *The Bankers in Bolivia: A Study in American Foreign Investment*, 1928. See also Nearing, Scott, *Dollar Diplomacy: A Study in American Imperialism*, 1925.

²⁹ *World Politics in Modern Civilization, the Contributions of Nationalism, Capitalism, Imperialism, and Militarism to Human Culture and International Anarchy*, 1930.

³⁰ *Christian Missions and Oriental Civilisations, A Study in Culture-Contact*,

³¹ *Siam Rural Economic Survey, 1930-1931, 1932.*

tions in the social sciences and cognate subjects have greatly stimulated the study of foreign cultures by subsidizing American students in their investigational activities abroad. Equally have they encouraged the study of American culture by foreign investigators. This is not a complete summary of the investigations of this type undertaken by sociologists, but it is representative of what has been and is being done along this line.

Numerous studies in immigration and migration, race relations, and Americanization also belong under this category of investigations bearing indirectly upon international relations. These topics will be treated later in a separate brief chapter.

There are several avenues through which we can gain a perspective of the interest of sociologists in the subjects bearing on the study of international relations. One of these is an examination of the annual proceedings and the *Publications* of the American Sociological Society. Table Number I shows the number of papers bearing on international relations presented at each of the annual sessions of the American Sociological Society since its organization in 1905 to the present time, as well as the percentage of these papers belonging to the general subjects of international relations and foreign cultures, and to the special subdivisions of the general field of international relation. It is evident from the table that the interests of the sociologists respond rather definitely to the interests of the general public, since the period at which most emphasis was placed upon international relations was during and immediately following the Great War. The proportion of studies of foreign cultures has greatly increased in recent years, especially since the war period. This fact may be taken to indicate a desire on the part of the sociologists to understand the peoples from whom we receive immigrants and with whom we have foreign relations. Such an understanding of other peoples is essential to a clear insight into our foreign relations themselves. This table also makes clear the fact that race and cultural relations and the related subjects of Americanization and

TABLE I. EMPHASIS ACCORDED THE SUBJECT OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS BY THE AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL SOCIETY, RECORDED BY YEARS.

Number of the Volume	Date of Publication	No. Papers Dealing with International Relations and Foreign Cultures. Distributed by Special Phases of the Subject												Total Number of Papers Presented by Years	Percentage of Papers Devoted to International Relations and Foreign Cultures		
		International War and Rivalry	Immigration, Migration, etc.	Race and Cultural Relations	International Organization and Unity	Communication, Diffusion, etc.	Miscellaneous	Population Problems	Nationality, Nationalism, etc.	Americanization and Assimilation	Propaganda	Total International Relations	Studies of Foreign Cultures and Languages				
I.....	1907							1				1		1	6	12.5	
II.....	1908			1								1		1	8	12.5	
III.....	1909														14	0.0	
IV.....	1910											1	1	14	7.1		
V.....	1911	1				1				1		3	1	4	14	25.6	
VI.....	1912		1									1		1	7	14.3	
VII.....	1913														10	0.0	
VIII.....	1914								1	5		6		6	11	54.2	
IX.....	1915														8	0.0	
X.....	1916	4							2			6		6	6	100.0	
XI.....	1917														14	0.0	
XII.....	1918	1	3		2							6		6	14	42.9	
XIII.....	1919			1					3			4		4	12	23.3	
XIV.....	1920			1						1		2		2	16	12.5	
XV.....	1921												1	1	13	7.7	
XVI.....	1922								1			1		1	20	5.0	
XVII.....	1923												1	1	22	4.5	
XVIII.....	1924			1	1							2	1	3	16	18.8	
XIX.....	1925		1	3		2				1	1	3	2	10	27	87.0	
XX.....	1926			1		1		1				1	4	1	5	40	12.5
XXI.....	1927			2	1							3	10	13	42	30.9	
XXII.....	1928		1	1								2	1	3	71	4.2	
XXIII.....	1929		3	1					1	4		9		9	74	12.1	
XXIV.....	1930			1	1	1				1	1	5	3	8	80	10.0	
XXV.....	1931	1	1	1								3	2	5	68	7.4	
XXVI.....	1932			3	1		1				1	6	3	14	72	19.4	
XXVII.....	1933													4	4	75	5.3
Totals.....		7	10	17	6	5	1	2	3	13	4	73	36	109	776	14.0	
Percent-ages	Int. Rels.....	9.6	13.7	23.3	8.2	6.8	1.4	2.7	11.0	17.3	5.5	100					
	All Foreign.....	6.4	9.2	15.6	5.5	4.6	.9	1.3	7.3	11.9	2.7	66.9	23.0	100			
	All Items.....	.9	1.3	2.2	.8	.6	.1	.3	1.0	1.7	.5	9.4	4.6	14.0	100		

assimilation have been the chief objects of study by the sociologists in the field of international relations in recent years. Immigration, itself closely related to the other two fields of interest, comes third in order. We may safely conclude, therefore, that the immigration and assimilation problems of our society dominate the interests of American sociologists in international relations. Next in importance in sociological interest is a group of related subjects bearing upon war, nationalism, and propaganda. There is also a third grouping of interest about such subjects as international organization and unity, communication and diffusion. This last grouping refers essentially to peace problems. On the basis of this showing of the interests of the professional sociologists as indicated by an analysis of the papers presented at their annual meetings over a period of twenty-seven years, it would seem desirable to give special emphasis in this monograph to the conclusions and opinions of the sociologists regarding immigration and assimilation, war, and peace activities and relations. It is also to be observed from Table I that 14 per cent of all of the papers presented by the sociologists at their annual meetings over this period of twenty-seven years dealt with either international relations as such or with the basic subject of foreign cultures. This fact is all the more significant when it is remembered that all domestic race and cultural relations (those concerned with Negroes) are excluded from these data. Papers dealing with the assimilation of immigrant and Indian groups are, however, included, since this subject represents a projection of international relations into our own community life.

The American Sociological Society devoted the whole of its eighth session (1913) to the subject of *The Problems of Social Assimilation*. Assimilation as here discussed was made to apply not only to foreign born persons, but also to Indians and Negroes born in this country, although papers dealing with Negro race and cultural relations have been omitted from our tables, as was stated above. The tenth (1915) session of the

Society, under the stimulation of the World War, took for its general theme War and Militarism in Their Sociological Aspects. At various other times the Society has considered important fundamental or basic questions of international relations. Thus in 1922 the American Sociological Society, upon the initiative of Jerome Davis, supported by E. A. Ross and others, appointed a committee with the definite commission to investigate the relation of news to international public opinion and to undertake such further tasks as it might see fit. In 1923 and 1924 H. A. Miller, the chairman, made reports for this committee. The Social Science Research Council was called upon to assume financial and directive responsibility, which it did in 1924. The object of the sociologists in referring the matter to the Social Science Research Council was to secure, in pursuance of their usual policy of cooperative research, the combined efforts of as many social sciences and as many viewpoints as possible in the investigation. For some reason, however, the Social Science Research Council was not active in pursuing this investigation and the matter finally dropped or was sidetracked from its original purpose.

Other basic papers of a comparable or related nature presented before the Society may also be listed in this connection. In 1922 E. A. Ross reported on methods of getting at significant social situations in foreign countries. In 1923 W. F. Willcox read a paper entitled "The Relation of the United States to International Statistics." In 1924 C. G. Dittmer gave the results of his studies on the density of population in North China, Donald R. Taft reported on "History Textbooks and International Differences," Jessie Ravitch on "Relative Rate of Change in Customs and Beliefs of Modern Jews," and Niles Carpenter on "Population Densities and the Immigration Policy of the United States." In this same year (1924) also there were research papers by E. E. Eubank on "Sociological Factors in the Interpretation of International Relations: With Specific Illustrations from Southeastern Europe and the Near East"; by Jerome Davis on "International

Aspects of the Russian Revolution"; by L. C. Dunn on "A Biological View of Race Mixture"; by E. B. Reuter on "The Hybrid as a Sociological Type"; by Ralph Linton on "An Anthropological View of Race Mixture"; and by Kimball Young on mental test results of various racial groups.

Another significant index to the interest of sociologists in international relations and in subjects definitely related to this field is to be found in the catalogue of Current Research Projects published annually in the *American Journal of Sociology* since 1929. These data cover the research undertakings of the sociologists reporting for the United States and Canada. Table Number II gives the classified results of the analysis made of these data by the writers of this monograph. This table shows results closely similar to those presented in Table Number I. Nearly one-tenth of all research in progress during the years 1929-32 dealt directly with international relations and six per cent of all research undertakings were in the related background field of foreign cultures. Here also race and cultural relations, Americanization and assimilation, and immigration take the lead over other fields of interest. War, however, scarcely appears among the research projects, probably because it is not easy to carry on such an investigation in an academic way from a purely sociological standpoint. Nationalism, and nationality, so closely related to war, do stand out as the second largest field of investigation in this list. Communication and diffusion and the related subject of missions—the leading peace subjects—come third in this table as in the preceding. Here again the interest in the cultural background of the peoples with whom we have international relations is very marked. Since we have no reports on sociological research prior to 1928, it is not possible to determine whether this strong emphasis on foreign cultures has increased in recent years, as was shown to be the case in connection with the annual meetings of the Society.

One more index will be presented to show the interests of sociologists in international relations and closely related or

TABLE II. DISTRIBUTION BY YEARS OF SUBJECTS OF SOCIOLOGICAL INVESTIGATION IN THE FIELD OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AS LISTED IN THE ANNUAL REPORTS ON SOCIOLOGICAL RESEARCH IN PROGRESS.¹

YEAR.....	1928 (1929)		1929 (1930)		1930 (1931)		1931 (1932)		1932 (1933)		Totals	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
TOPIOS OF INVESTIGATION.												
All Topics.....	289 ²	100	242	100	247	100	305	100	309	100	1103 ³	100
Studies in International Relations.....	32	11.07	37	15.29	28	11.34	20	6.56	20	6.47	105	9.53
1. War.....	1	.40	1	.09
2. Peace.....	1	.35
3. Immigration, Migration, etc.....	5	1.73	2	.83	3	1.21	1	.33	2	.65	8	.73
4. Cultural and Race Relations.....	12	4.15	13	5.37	14	5.67	8	2.62	3	.98	38	3.46
5. International Unity.....	1	.41	1	.40	2	.18
6. Imperialism.....	1	.35	1	.32	1	.09
7. Communication, Diffusion, etc.....	1	.35	4	1.65	3	1.21	4	1.31	11	1.00
8. Missions.....	1	.35	3	1.24	1	.40	1	.33	5	.46
9. Population Problems.....	2	.69
10. Nationality, Nationalism, etc.....	5	1.73	7	2.89	2	.81	8	2.62	7	2.23	24	2.18
11. Americanization and Assimilation.....	4	1.39	7	2.89	1	.40	2	.66	2	.65	13	1.09
12. International Law.....	1	.40	1	.32	2	.18
13. Miscellaneous.....	1	.40	1	.09
Studies in Foreign Cultures.....	15	5.19	19	7.82	18	7.33	14	4.59	17	5.51	68	6.17
Total Studies Relating to Foreign Themes..	47	16.26	56	23.14	45	18.26	34	11.15	37	11.97	173	15.68

¹See *Amer. J. Sociol.*, XXXIV:758-776; XXXV:445-463; XXXVI:112-118, 782-809; XXXVII:620-643; XXXVIII:732-764.²For the year 1928 (1929) the same item was sometimes classified under more than one category, hence there is a certain amount of repetition, and the percentages are only approximately correct.³This figure represents the total of the last four years—1929 (1930)-1932 (1933)—only. The first year's data are excluded from this column because of duplications.

supporting themes. In the following tables the graduate theses listed in the *American Journal of Sociology* annually as in process of preparation are analyzed and compared with the total number of sociological theses listed as in process in the several years indicated. Data for certain years are omitted because they were not published for those years. While the list of theses in process of preparation is not complete—and the list of M.A. theses is obviously less complete than that of the Ph.D. theses—it is nevertheless sufficiently full to permit of valid generalizations from the data presented. Some of the theses reappear once, or more frequently, in the lists in successive years, but since this is presumably as true of the theses other than those bearing on foreign culture and international or other foreign³² relations, it should have no adverse effect upon the computations and interpretations.

Tables III and IV confirm the indications of Tables I and II, already discussed, with regard to the proportion of sociological investigation relating to foreign and international social problems and situations. In both the Ph.D. and the M.A. theses this percentage is in excess of that indicated by the papers presented at the annual meetings and by the research projects of the professional sociologists. Furthermore, the percentage for the Ph.D. theses (18.6) is slightly in excess of that for the M.A. theses (16.92). However, both types of theses show almost the same emphasis upon strictly international and foreign relations as distinguished from foreign cultures. The Ph.D. theses indicate a stronger interest in foreign cultures as such than do the M.A. theses. In both types of theses the chief emphasis, within the general category of international and foreign relations, is upon nationality and nationalism (34.2 and 37.25 per cent for the Ph.D. and M.A. theses, respectively), cultural and race relations (20.78 and 26.17 per cent, respectively), Americanization and assimilation (10.82 and 10.74 per cent

³² The term foreign relations covers the relations of different immigrant or national or unassimilated groups, even when literally speaking they are not inter-

TABLE III. DISTRIBUTION OF PH. D. THESES IN SOCIOLOGY IN PROCESS AS REPORTED IN THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY FOR THE YEARS 1916-1932 BY VARIOUS PHASES OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND BY FOREIGN CULTURE.

Years Theses Were in Process...	1916	1917	1919	1920	1921	1922	1923	1924	1927	1928	1929	1930	1931	1932	Totals.	Percentages.		
Total Number Theses Listed...	100	110	64	76	72	131	89	115	113	162	193	235	130	243	1833	of 1833	of 341	of 231
Total Number in Foreign Sub- jects.....	14	17	14	18	14	28	18	15	19	26	31	48	30	49	341	18.6
Total Number in Foreign Cul- tures.....	4	5	6	3	4	8	6	5	10	7	6	16	6	24	110	6.0	32.26
Total Number in Foreign Rela- tions.....	10	12	8	15	10	20	12	10	9	19	25	32	24	25	231	12.6	67.74
1. War.....	1		3	1	1	1			1	1		1	1		11	.60	3.23	4.76
2. Peace.....						1						1	1	1	4	.22	1.17	1.73
3. Immigration, Migration...	1	1	1				2	2	1	2	1	3	2	1	17	.93	4.99	7.36
4. Cultural and Race Relations	1	5	1	4	1	3	3	3	2	4	6	7	3	5	48	2.62	14.08	20.78
5. Communication, Diffusion.				1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1			10	.55	2.92	4.23
6. Migrations.....	2				1	2	2	1							10	.55	2.92	4.23
7. Americanization, Assimila- tion.....	2	1	2	2	1	1	1	1			5	4	4	1	25	1.36	7.33	10.83
8. Nationality, Nationalism...	3	4	1	6	5	9	2		3	8	9	10	8	11	79	4.31	23.17	34.20
9. World Unity.....														1	1	.05	.29	.43
10. International Organization.				1				1			1	2	1	1	7	.38	2.05	2.98
11. Imperialism.....	1								1	1					3	.16	.88	1.30
12. Population.....						1		1		1	1	2	3	4	16	.87	4.99	6.93

XXI: 379-433; XXII: 963-967; XXV: 32-56; XXVI: 96-100, 767-770; XXVIII: 79-85; XXIX: 85-90; XXX: 196-200; XXXII: 373-378; XXXIII: 118; XXXIV: 349-365; XXXV: 376-386; XXXVI: 31-33; XXXVII: 94-106; XXXVIII: 79-92.

respectively), and immigration and migration (7.36 and 8.39 per cent, respectively). The general excess emphasis of the M.A. theses in these fields appears to be due in part at least to the large number of relatively local studies of these relations between nationality and immigrant groups undertaken by the candidates for M.A. degrees. On the other hand, such abstract problems as war, peace, international organization, imperialism, and other international population pressures are handled mainly by the candidates for the Ph.D. degrees. These more abstract and general subjects are, however, decidedly in the minority.

In general, we may say that the results of the analysis represented by Tables III and IV confirm our earlier impression that the interests of American sociologists in international relations center primarily around immigration and assimilation problems. Approximately 39 per cent of Ph.D. theses and 45 per cent of all M.A. theses concentrated definitely on such subjects, including migration, immigration, race and cultural relations and Americanization and assimilation. An even stronger apparent emphasis is that upon international rivalry and conflict, the corresponding percentages for the Ph.D. and M.A. theses being approximately 47 and 45 for the subjects of war, nationality, nationalism, imperialism, and population problems.⁸⁸ Here, as elsewhere, the emphasis upon peace and peaceful relations is minor. The combined percentages for the topics peace,

⁸⁸ These percentages are, however, somewhat deceptive, if we consider them as belonging strictly to the category of foreign and international conflict and rivalry. The subjects nationalism and nationality are not concerned exclusively with conflict attitudes, and even when they are so concerned they may still be definitely related to that of immigration, if not to assimilation. On the other hand, not all race and cultural relations are assimilative, although most of them are related pretty closely to immigration. Some of them, however, deal primarily with conflict and rivalry. In spite of these contradictions of classification, it seemed best, for the immediate purpose in mind, to classify race and cultural relations with immigration and assimilation and to classify nationalism and nationality with conflict relations. But, since conflict relations are not necessarily incompatible with immigration and assimilation problems, we may consider that conflict overlaps with immigration.

— it is, we think, quite proper to assert that Tables III and IV, as well as I, that American sociologists are primarily interested in immigration and assimilation, as far as their studies of foreign relations are concerned. The category immigration problems obviously includes a considerable portion of the material on conflict of foreign cultures.

TABLE IV. DISTRIBUTION OF M. A. THESES IN SOCIOLOGY IN PROCESS AS REPORTED IN THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY FOR THE YEARS 1916-1932 BY VARIOUS PHASES OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND BY FOREIGN CULTURES.

Years Theses Were in Process...	1916	1917	1919	1920	1921	1922	1923	1924	1927	1928	1929	1930	1931	1932	Totals.	Percentages.
Total No. Theses Listed.....	64	111	61	102	92	121	144	173	170	176	189	332	345	331	2411	Of 2409 of 408 of 298
Total No. Foreign Subjects.....	10	22	14	22	14	26	23	30	30	33	27	53	37	67	408	16.92
Total No. Foreign Cultures.....	4	4	4	4	10	6	7	6	10	10	9	19	12	9	110	4.55
Total No. Foreign Relations.....	10	18	10	18	4	20	16	24	20	23	18	34	25	58	298	12.35
1. War.....		2	4	1			1		1		1		1		11	.46
2. Peace.....								3				1			4	.17
3. Immigration, Migration...	1	3	1	1		1	2	2	2	2	1	5	1	3	25	1.04
4. Cultural and Race Relations.....	1	3		1	1	5	1	7	7	7	5	13	7	20	78	3.24
5. Communication, Diffusion.			1	1		1		1	2	1		2	2	3	14	.58
6. Missions.....				3			1						1		5	.21
7. Americanization, Assimilation.....	3	2	1	5		2	2	3	2			3	3	6	32	1.33
8. Nationality, Nationalism..	4	6	3	6	2	11	9	7	5	10	8	7	8	25	111	7.60
9. International Organisation.	1									1	2	1			5	.21
10. Imperialism.....		2			1				1	1			1		6	.25
11. International Law.....												1		1	1	.04
12. Internationalism.....											1				1	.04
13. Population.....								1				1	2		5	.21
																1.22

XXI:683-693; XXII:907-971; XXV:66-69; XXVI:100-104, 770-774; XXVIII:35-60; XXIX:39-66; XXX:200-209; XXXII:978-996; XXXIII:118-119; XXXIV:353-363; XXXV:365-393; XXXVI:93-111; XXXVII:104-124; XXXVIII:92-108.

communication and diffusion, missions, world unity, international organization, international law, and internationalism were approximately 14 for the Ph.D. theses and 10 for the M.A. theses. In both types of studies specific concern with peace is decidedly less marked than that with war. This statistical fact probably does not indicate that sociologists as such are not much interested in the promotion of peace, but rather that the dramatic appeal of war subjects is greater and that to date the negative approach to peace through a positive attack upon war appears to offer greater possibilities of success. When the struggle for peace comes to be better defined and gains more positive content it is likely that sociological investigation will emphasize this aspect more fully. This indirect approach is further illustrated by the fact that studies of the peaceful subjects concentrate mainly on problems in communication and diffusion and missions rather than on peace, world unity, international organization and law and internationalism as such. Likewise, the study of conflict situations tends to center about relatively concrete topics dealing with nationality, nationalism, and population rather than on the more abstract themes of war and imperialism.

Tables V and VI show the percentages by years of the different types of international or foreign relations and foreign culture studies. The total emphasis upon foreign subjects, including both foreign relations and foreign cultures, fluctuates greatly from year to year for both the Ph.D. and the M.A. theses, but there is no marked trend either toward an increase or a decrease in emphasis. The same may be said of the studies in foreign relations and in foreign cultures. When we come to analyze the several phases of the study of foreign relations in detail we do find some definite trends between 1916 and 1932. For example, the emphasis on war studies in both types of theses was much greater in early years than later. For Ph.D. theses the decline in emphasis upon war has been to considerably less than one-half while for M.A. theses it has been to less than one-third. Although the data are meagre on this

TABLE V. DISTRIBUTION OF PH. D. THESES IN SOCIOLOGY IN PROCESS AS REPORTED IN THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY, FOR THE YEARS 1916-1932 BY VARIOUS PHASES OF FOREIGN SUBJECTS IN TERMS OF PERCENTAGES OF THE WHOLE NUMBER OF FOREIGN SUBJECTS.

Years Theses Were in Process	1916	1917	1919	1920	1921	1922	1923	1924	1927	1928	1929	1930	1931	1932
Total Number Theses Listed	100	110	64	76	72	131	89	115	113	162	193	225	130	243
Total Number Foreign Subjects	14	17	14	18	14	28	18	15	19	26	31	48	30	49
Total Per cent Foreign Subjects	14.0	15.5	21.9	23.7	19.4	21.4	20.2	13.0	16.8	16.0	16.1	20.4	23.1	20.2
Total Number Foreign Relations	10	12	8	15	10	20	12	10	9	19	25	32	24	25
Total Per cent Foreign Relations	71.4	70.6	57.1	83.3	71.4	71.4	66.7	66.7	47.4	73.1	80.6	66.7	80.0	61.0
1. War	7.14		21.4	5.6	7.1	3.6			5.3	3.9		2.1	3.3	
2. Peace						3.6						2.1	3.3	2.0
3. Immigration, Migration	7.1	5.9	7.1			11.1		13.3	5.3	7.7	3.2	6.3	6.7	2.0
4. Cultural and Race Relations	7.1	29.4	7.1	22.2	7.1	10.7	16.7	20.0	10.5	15.4	16.4	14.6	10.0	10.2
5. Communication, Diffusion				5.6	7.1	3.6	5.6	6.7	5.3	7.7	3.2	2.1		
6. Missions	4.3				7.1	10.7	16.7	6.7						
7. Americanization, Assimilation	14.3	5.9	14.3	11.1	7.1	3.6	5.6	6.7			16.1	8.3	13.3	2.0
8. Nationality, Nationalism	21.4	23.5	7.1	33.3	35.7	32.1	11.1		16.8	30.8	29.0	20.8	26.7	22.5
9. World Unity														2.0
10. International Organization				5.6				6.7			3.2	4.2	3.2	2.0
11. Imperialism		5.9							5.3	3.9				
12. Population						3.6		6.7			3.9	6.3	13.3	2.3
Total Number Foreign Cultures	4	5	6	3	4	8	6	5	10	7	6	16	6	24
Total Per cent Foreign Cultures	28.6	29.4	43.9	16.7	28.6	28.6	33.3	33.3	52.6	26.9	19.4	33.3	30.0	49.0

XXI:379-683; XXII:333-687; XXV:33-66; XXVI:96-100, 767-770; XXVIII:79-85; XXIX:35-39; XXX:195-200; XXXII:373-378; XXXIII:116; XXXIV:345-356; XXXV:375-385; XXXVI:31-93; XXXVII:94-106; XXXVIII:79-92.

point, it seems to be clearly indicated that there has been a decided growth of interest in peace studies, especially in Ph.D. theses. There is also a clear, but not a marked, decline in interest in immigration as such, indicated especially by the M.A. theses. Interest in cultural and race relations has grown somewhat more markedly than interest in immigration has declined. This increase of interest in cultural and race relations is most noticeable in connection with the M.A. theses. Interest in communication and diffusion appears to have been rather fluctuating, and no decided trends are observable, unless it may be said that there is a slightly upward trend in the M.A. theses. Essentially the same may be said of the study of missions. There may be somewhat of a decline in interest in the problems of Americanization and assimilation, although the fluctuations are so great in this connection that it is difficult to speak positively regarding the matter. The same is true with regard to the subjects nationality and nationalism. Interest in international organization appears to have increased, although irregularly, among both the writers of Ph.D. and M.A. theses. Little can be said about imperialism, world unity, internationalism, and international law, except that the interest is meagre and fluctuating, if we may trust the evidence of our rather inadequate data. But it is quite clear that interest in international and foreign population problems is definitely and markedly on the increase, especially for the Ph.D. theses, and only slightly less so for the M.A. theses.

A study made by Howard Becker entitled "Distribution of Space in the *American Journal of Sociology*, 1895-1927"²⁴ throws some light upon the questions discussed in this chapter. Although Becker's categories do not correspond completely with our own, they are sufficiently similar for his results to be cited here. He classifies all the papers published in the journal referred to under ten categories, three of which are related to our own. He finds that the number of articles devoted to

²⁴ *Amer. Jl. Sociol.*, XXXVI: 461-466 (Nov., 1930).

TABLE VI: DISTRIBUTION OF M. A. THESES IN SOCIOLOGY IN PROCESS AS REPORTED IN THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY FOR THE YEARS 1916-1932 BY VARIOUS PHASES OF FOREIGN SUBJECTS IN TERMS OF PERCENTAGES OF THE WHOLE NUMBER OF FOREIGN SUBJECTS.

Years Theses Were in Process	1916	1917	1919	1920	1921	1922	1923	1924	1927	1928	1929	1930	1931	1932
Total Number Theses Listed	64	111	61	102	92	121	144	173	170	176	189	332	345	381
Total Number Foreign Subjects	10	22	14	22	14	26	23	30	30	33	27	53	37	67
Total Per cent Foreign Subjects	15.6	19.8	22.7	21.6	15.2	21.5	16.0	17.3	17.6	18.7	14.3	16.0	10.7	20.2
Total Number Foreign Relations	10	18	10	18	4	20	16	24	20	23	18	34	25	58
Total Per cent Foreign Relations	100	81.8	71.4	81.8	28.6	76.9	69.6	80.0	66.7	69.7	66.7	64.2	67.6	86.0
1. War		9.1	28.6	4.6			4.4		3.3		3.7		2.7	
2. Peace								10.0				1.9		
3. Immigration, Migration	10.0	13.6	7.1	4.5		3.9	8.7	6.7	6.7	6.1	3.7	9.4	2.7	4.5
4. Cultural and Race Relations	10.0	13.6		4.5	7.1	19.2	4.4	23.3	23.3	21.2	18.5	24.5	18.9	30.0
5. Communication, Diffusion			7.1	4.5		3.9		3.3	6.7	3.0		3.8	5.4	4.5
6. Missions				13.6			4.4						2.7	
7. Americanization, Assimilation	30.0	9.1	7.1	22.7		7.7	8.7	10.0	6.7			5.7	8.1	9.0
8. Nationality, Nationalism	40.0	27.3	21.4	27.3	14.3	42.3	39.1	23.3	16.7	30.3	29.6	18.2	21.6	37.8
9. International Organization	10.0									3.0	7.4	1.9		
10. Imperialism		9.1			7.1				3.3	3.0				1.5
11. International Law												1.9		
12. Internationalism											3.7			
13. Population								3.3		3.0		1.9	5.4	
Total Number Foreign Cultures	0	4	4	4	10	6	7	6	10	10	9	19	12	9
Total Per cent Foreign Cultures		18.2	28.6	18.2	71.4	23.1	30.4	20.0	33.3	30.3	33.3	35.5	33.4	13.4

XXXI: 632-635; XXII: 667-671; XXV: 66-69; XXVI: 100-104, 770-774; XXVIII: 85-90; XXX: 89-95; XXX: 200-209; XXXII: 578-580; XXXIII: 118-119; XXXIV: 355-363; XXXV: 286-295; XXXVI: 93-111; XXXVII: 106-124; XXXVIII: 92-103.

Peoples and Cultural Groups shows a relatively high level before 1911, "then a rapid decline to a low level in 1921, and then a rapid rise to its highest point in the last year charted" (1927). Papers on Conflict and Accommodation Groups show "a very gradual upward trend up to 1914, then a rapid rise to a peak in 1916, and then a rapid decline to the lowest point reached, 3.8 per cent in 1923." Studies of Communities and Territorial Groups show, "on the whole, a gradual downward trend."⁸⁵ Unfortunately, Becker does not distribute his various categories by percentages. The value of Becker's conclusions as an index to the interests of sociologists is somewhat further lessened by the fact that the editors of the *American Journal of Sociology* have exercised a rigorous selection upon the articles published in that magazine, and there is some reason to suppose that their interests do not coincide fully with those of the body of American sociologists as a whole.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 464.

CHAPTER III

IMMIGRATION AND ASSIMILATION

ONE of the earliest phases of investigation of subjects pertaining to international relations undertaken by sociologists was that of immigration. The study of this subject falls logically, and for the most part historically, into three major phases: the statistical, the national welfare aspect, and that of race and immigrant attitudes. The first important statistical work on the subject of immigration was made by Richmond Mayo-Smith.¹ Carroll D. Wright, as United States Commissioner of Labor and Director of the Census, made many contributions to the statistical study of immigration and supervised a number of reports dealing with this field.² In 1911 the massive report of the United States Immigration Commission, largely statistical in character, appeared in 41 volumes under the direction of J. W. Jenks, one of the earliest teachers of sociology in this country. Professor Walter F. Willcox, of Cornell University, has also been a large contributor to the statistical study of immigration and migration. He has, in particular, given his editorial direction to two very important studies in connection with international migration. The former of these was compiled for the International Labor Office, Geneva,³ and the latter was undertaken for the National Bureau of Economic Research, New York.⁴ Jerome has attempted by means of statistics to demonstrate the connection between the business cycle and immigration.⁵ The early immigration

¹ *Emigration and Immigration*, 1898. George Tucker, Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Virginia, published papers on the statistics of immigration in *Hunt's Merchants' Magazine* in the eighteen-forties, but only as part of a larger study on the *Progress of Population and Wealth in the United States in Fifty Years (1842-1843)*.

² See, e. g., his *Influence of Trade Unions on Immigrants Employed in the Packing Business in Chicago*, U. S. Bureau of Labor, Bull. 56, Jan., 1905; *Outline of Practical Sociology*, 1899, Ch. VII.

³ *International Migrations*, Vol. I: "Statistics," 1929.

⁴ *Ibid.*, Vol. II: "Interpretations," 1931.

⁵ Jerome, Harry, *Migration and Business Cycles*, 1926.

studies of a statistical character were essentially demographic and economic in character, while the more recent studies have shown a trend in the direction of the geographic and ecological. The investigations of Park and McKenzie on the Pacific Coast and of McKenzie in the Detroit area, in so far as they have been statistical, have revealed these trends.

The major emphasis in the study of immigration was, however, from the first primarily upon the national and social welfare implications. In the early days of the free settlement of the Americas—both North and South—immigration was much encouraged for the sake of the economic development of the newly exploited regions. Practically all the discussions were propagandistic in character and favored the importation, at first of agricultural settlers, and later of industrial workers. This propaganda aspect of the discussion of immigration has continued among the large scale industrialists, and in a few backward rural states among those promoting agricultural development, almost or quite to the present day. But as the supply of farm and industrial labor became excessive in the last few decades of the nineteenth century and as free land began to disappear, a calmer and keener analysis of the subject began to make its appearance. As early as 1890, Francis A. Walker pointed out in his presidential address before the American Economic Association that the supposed advantages of an unrestricted immigration were largely mythical. In this and other papers he demonstrated mathematically that immigration had not increased the population of the United States, but had merely replaced infant native born by adult foreign born individuals.⁶

The Chinese immigration in the early West perhaps precipitated the question of national welfare in connection with immigration. As early as 1876 the California State Legislature appointed a commission to study this question. This commission

⁶ See some republished articles on immigration in his *Discussions in Economics and Statistics*, Vol. II, pp. 415-451 (1899).

reported in 1877. Also in 1876 the National Congress appointed a special committee on Chinese immigration, which made a searching inquiry.⁷ In 1899 Professor E. A. Ross, of Stanford University, was dismissed for opposing oriental immigration on public welfare grounds. The whole controversy has been summarized by another former Stanford University professor of sociology.⁸ In the meantime the eastern or industrial section of the United States had begun to grow uneasy regarding the ever rising tide of southern and eastern Europeans who were pouring into the country and not infrequently replacing the native workers and the more completely adjusted older immigrant laborers. The chief protest against these newer immigrants, who, unlike the older immigrants, went to the industries in cities instead of to the farms, was voiced by the laborers. It was made on the economic ground that the immigrant worker undersold the labor market and forced the previously adjusted workers from their jobs. The sociological protest was to the effect that immigrant labor competition thus forced down the standard of living of industrial workers generally, lowered the cultural—i. e., the educational, religious, moral, and citizenship—levels of American industrial society, and tended to build up large unassimilated, if not unassimilable, cultural islands in our population.⁹ Leaders among the sociologists in this protest movement were Frank Julian Warne,¹⁰ Henry Pratt Fairchild,¹¹ and Jenks and Lauck.¹²

Many other sociologists have discussed the question with more or less definite implications for public policy and pro-

⁷ Seward, G. F., *Chinese Immigration*, 1881.

⁸ Coolidge, Mary Roberts, *Chinese Immigration*, 1909.

⁹ Cooley, Angell, and Carr, *Introductory Sociology*, 1933, pp. 291-292; Reinhardt, J. M. and Davies, G. R., *Principles and Methods of Sociology*, 1932, pp. 186-187, 383-385; Bushee, F. A., *Social Organisation*, 1930, p. 78; Sutherland, E. H., *Criminology*, 1924, pp. 132-133; Devine, E. T., *The Principles of Relief*, 1905, pp. 162-170; Dow, G. E., *Introduction to the Principles of Sociology*, 1920, pp. 86-102, etc.

¹⁰ *The Slav Invasion*, 1904; *The Immigrant Invasion*, 1913; and *The Tide of Immigration*, 1916.

¹¹ *Greek Immigration to the United States*, 1911; *Immigration, a World Movement and Its American Significance*, 1913; *The Melting Pot Mistake*, 1926.

¹² Jenks, J. W. and Lauck, W. J., *The Immigration Problem*, 1900.

cedure, together with a general emphasis upon a sociological viewpoint.¹³ Interest in immigration has by no means declined since the passage of federal legislation radically restricting immigrant quotas. In fact, it may perhaps be said that more active academic attention is now being given to this subject than ever before. The newer works are frequently much more objectively analytical and constructive than the older ones. The attempt is decidedly to get beneath the surface in discussing public policy with regard to immigration, and to discover through patient research the data necessary for such discussion. A considerable number of background studies of various types of immigrants, of various grades of scientific accuracy and objectivity, has been made.¹⁴

On the other hand, there has always been another school of students of immigration—apologists, one might better say. This is the sentimental or humanitarian school. Their viewpoint is as definitely propagandistic as that of the industrialists, but it is taken from another angle. They oppose immigra-

¹³ See, e. g., Whelpley, J. D., *The Problem of the Immigrant*, 1905; Hall, P. F., *Immigration*, 1908; Roberts, Peter, *The New Immigration*, 1912; Ross, E. A., *The Old World in the New*, 1914; Davie, M. R., *A Constructive Immigration Policy*, 1928; MacLean, Annie Marion, *Modern Immigration*, 1925; Garis, R. L., *Immigration Restriction*, 1927; Young, Donald, *American Minority Peoples*, 1932. This last volume contains an excellent bibliography.

¹⁴ See, in addition to similar works already cited, Bernheimer, C. S. (ed.), *The Russian Jew in the United States*, 1905; Baskerville, Beatrice C., *The Polish Jew*, 1906; Faust, Albert B., *The German Element in the United States*, 2 vols., 1909; Joseph, Samuel, *Jewish Immigration to the United States*, 1910; Burgess, Thomas, *Greeks in America*, 1913; Gulick, S. A., *The American Japanese Problem*, 1914; Millis, H. A., *The Japanese Problem in the United States*, 1915; Ford, H. J., *The Scotch-Irish in America*, 1915; Steiner, J. F., *The Japanese Invasion*, 1917; Foerster, R. F., *The Italian Emigration of Our Times*, 1919; Capek, Thomas, *The Czechs in America*, 1920; Kellor, Frances, *Immigration and the Future*, 1920; Davis, M. M., *Immigrant Health and the Community*, 1921; Davis, Jerome, *The Russian and Ruthenian in America*, 1922; *The Russian Immigrant*, 1923; Fox, Paul, *The Poles in America*, 1922; Miller, K. D., *The Czecho-Slovaks in America*, 1922; Rose, P. M., *The Italians in America*, 1922; Souders, D. A., *The Magyars in America*, 1922; Xenides, J. P., *The Greeks in America*, 1922; Stella, Antonio, *Some Aspects of Italian Immigration to the United States*, 1924; Abbott, Edith, *Historical Aspects of the Immigration Problem*, 1926; Jones, H. M., *America and French Culture*, 1927; McKensie, B. D., *Oriental Exclusion*, 1928; Mears, E. G., *Resident Orientals on the American Pacific Coast*, 1928; Gamio, Manuel, *Mexican Immigration to the United States*, 1930; *The Mexican Immigrant*, 1930; Laaker, Bruno, *Filipino Immigration*, 1931; Blegen, T. C., *Norwegian Migration to America*, 1931; Janson, Florence Edith, *The Background of Swedish Immigration, 1840-1930*, 1931; Stephenson, G. M., *The Religious Aspects of Swedish Immigration*, 1932.

tion restriction on some so-called humanitarian basis. Woodrow Wilson expressed one variety of this viewpoint when he declared, however sincerely, in vetoing the immigrant exclusion bill in 1915, that America had always been the refuge of the oppressed and that we should not reverse our policy in this respect now.¹⁵ This is a popular vote-getting argument. Various immigrant nationality groups usually oppose restriction, and radicals with what is sometimes superficially called a "general humanitarian slant" often take sides with the immigrant through sympathy rather than because of any profound analysis of the social situation. There are many books, some of which do not always merit the characterization of scientific, which express these viewpoints, whatever may be the underlying motives behind them.¹⁶

The entrance of the United States as a belligerent into the Great War brought on a rather hysterical realization of the lack of cultural unity in this country, due largely to unrestricted and unassimilated immigration. The result of this new understanding was a two-fold movement among sociologists, one of which was theoretical and investigational and the other largely practical and administrative. The former impulse resulted in a more intensive study of the attitudes, capacities, and culture of immigrants and the relations of immigrants and races in the United States. The latter trend was manifested in attempts at assimilation and in the theory and pedagogy of what was called Americanization. A very considerable literature grew up around both of these major fields of interest, but we have not space for more than a list of the leading books and a few outstanding periodical articles on Americanization, which began to appear at this time. The Carnegie Corporation of New York encouraged and

¹⁵ Wilson, Woodrow, *The New Democracy*, 2 vols., 1926, Vol. I, pp. 252-253.

¹⁶ See, e. g., Holt, Hamilton (ed.), *Undistinguished Americans*, 1906; Balch, Emily Greene, *Our Slavic Fellow Citizens*, 1910; Hourwich, Isaac A., *Immigration and Labor*, 1912; Clark, F. E., *Our Italian Fellow Citizens*, 1919; Abbott, Grace, *The Immigrant and the Community*, 1921; Panunzio, C. M., *The Soul of the Immigrant*, 1922; Claghorn, Kate H., *The Immigrant's Day in Court*, 1923.

financed a series of Americanization Studies, under the general direction of Allen T. Burns, beginning in 1918. Eleven volumes, some of which have already been mentioned, appeared as the result of this investigational enterprise.¹⁷ Another extensive investigation of similar character bearing upon international relations was the Pacific Coast Race Relations Survey undertaken on the Pacific Coast (1923-1925) under the direction of Robert E. Park and participated in by R. D. McKenzie, E. S. Bogardus, Howard Woolston, and several other sociologists. Only fragmentary results of this survey have as yet been published, and we still have to wait for a comprehensive presentation of its findings. Various textbooks and guides to Americanization also have been prepared.¹⁸ The term Americanization is but little used at the present time, owing partly to the strong reaction against the propagandistic methods and cultural and national intolerance that became so prominent during the war period. However, the work formerly covered by this term continues under different investigational and administrative categories, as we have intimated above.

The large literature on the problems of Negro adjustment testifies to our interest in the question of domestic race relations. The theoretical or general discussion of race relations in this country first became important, in the sense of the volume of literature published, in the decades preceding the Civil War, when several works appeared.¹⁹ The theory of

¹⁷ The list of volumes is as follows: *Schooling of the Immigrant*, by Frank V. Thompson, 1920; *America via the Neighborhood*, by John Daniels, 1920; *Old World Traits Transplanted*, by R. E. Park and H. A. Miller, 1921; *Immigrant Health and the Community*, by M. M. Davis, Jr., 1921; *A Stake in the Land*, by Peter A. Speck, 1921; *New Homes for Old*, by S. P. Breckinridge, 1921; *The Immigrant Press and Its Control*, by R. E. Park, 1922; *Americans by Choice*, by John P. Gavit, 1922; *The Immigrant's Day in Court*, by Kate Holladay Claghorn, 1923; *Adjusting Immigrant and Industry*, by W. M. Leiserson, 1924; and *Summary*, by Allen T. Burns.

¹⁸ Among these are Davis, Philip, *Immigration and Americanization*, 1920; Roberts, Peter, *The Problem of Americanization*, 1920; Bogardus, E. S., *Essentials of Americanization*, 1923; Sharlip, William and Owens, A. A., *Adult Immigrant Edu-*

¹⁹ Among the earlier publications of this type may be mentioned Nott, J. C., *Two Lectures on the Natural History of the Caucasian and Negro Races*, 1844; Nott, J. C. and Gliddon, G. R., *Types of Mankind*, 1854; *Indigenous Races of the*

race relations came to be of scientific interest to sociologists about the time that W. I. Thomas published his paper on race prejudice.³⁰ For purposes of investigation the sociological problem of race prejudice has been broken up and transformed into various problems of race attitudes, many of which have been studied experimentally. Here again W. I. Thomas took the lead with his study of the Polish peasant.³¹ Associates of Thomas and others made further studies.³² Recently more intensive techniques have been applied to the study of race and nationality attitudes, such as the measurement of social distance³³ and the ecological³⁴ and analytical³⁵ approaches. Much attention has also been given recently to the measurement of intelligence and the emotions of immigrants and the children of immigrants and to the study of their attitudinal set-up.³⁶ Likewise, studies have been made of the vocational and cultural attitudes of immigrants³⁷ and of their economic and

Earth, 1857; Bachman, John, *Doctrine of the Unity of the Human Race*, 1850; Smyth, Thomas, *The Unity of the Human Race Proved*, 1850; Baldwin, S. D., *Dominion; or the Unity and Trinity of the Human Race*, 1857; Cabell, J. L., *The Testimony of Modern Science to the Unity of Mankind*, 1858.

³⁰ "The Psychology of Race Prejudice," *Amer. J. Sociol.*, IX: 593-611 (Mar., 1904).

³¹ Thomas, W. I. and Znaniecki, Florian, *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America*, 2d ed., 2 vols., 1927 (1st ed., 5 vols., 1918-21).

³² See, e. g., Park, R. E. and Miller, H. A., *Old World Traits Transplanted*, 1921; Park, R. E., *The Immigrant Press and Its Control*, 1922; "Immigrant Heritages," *Nat. Conf. Social Work*, 1921, pp. 492-497; "Bases of Race Prejudice," *Annals Amer. Acad. Polit. and Soc. Sci.*, CXL: 11-20 (Nov., 1928); Carpenter, Niles, *Nationality, Color, and Economic Opportunity in the City of Buffalo*, 1927; Lasker, Bruno, *Race Attitudes in Children*, 1928; Carpenter, Niles and Katz, Daniel, *A Study of Acculturation in the Polish Group of Buffalo*, 1926-1928, 1929; Lasker, Bruno, *Jewish Experiences in America*, 1930; Wessel, Bessie Bloom, *Ethnic Survey of Woonsocket, Rhode Island*, 1931.

³³ See Bogardus, E. S., *Immigration and Race Attitudes*, 1928; also numerous articles and papers by Bogardus and others dealing with social distance, published in *Sociology and Social Research* and elsewhere.

³⁴ Lind, A. W., "Some Ecological Patterns of Community Disorganization in Honolulu," *Amer. J. Sociol.*, XXXVI: 206-220 (Sept., 1930).

³⁵ Brown, L. Guy, *Immigration, Cultural Conflicts and Adjustments*, 1932.

³⁶ See Boody, Bertha M., *A Psychological Study of Immigrant Children at Ellis Island*, 1926; Kirkpatrick, Clifford, *Intelligence and Immigration*, 1926; Carpenter, Niles, *Immigrants and Their Children*, 1927; Brunner, E. deS., *Immigrant Farmers and Their Children*, 1929.

³⁷ Leiserson, W. M., *Adjusting Immigrant and Industry*, 1924; National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, *Report on Crime and Criminal Justice in Relation to the Foreign Born*, Government Printing Office, Washington, 1931.

political adjustments.²⁸ One other aspect of racial and cultural relations, closely connected with immigration, remains to be mentioned. Since the war, deportation has been much more frequent than formerly, and often it has been carried out for political and social reasons. There are many studies, mostly in the form of papers and magazine articles, on this subject.²⁹

It must be apparent from the foregoing brief analysis that the study of immigration in this country has developed gradually from a primary emphasis upon the demographic and economic and political aspects toward a careful and detailed cultural analysis of immigrants and immigrant adjustments, stated primarily in terms of psychological measurements and sociological and psycho-social pattern analyses. It was inevitable that investigation in this subject should undergo such changes and additions as it became more scientific and better controlled. Along with this transition in the methods and objects of investigation in this field has gone a parallel emphasis upon the social psychology and the sociology of assimilation.

²⁸ Drachsler, Julius, *Democracy and Assimilation*, 1920; Laughlin, H. H., *Analysis of America's Modern Melting Pot*, Government Printing Office, Washington, 1922; Europe as an Emigrant-Exporting Continent and the United States as an Immigrant-Receiving Nation, Government Printing Office, Washington, 1924; Lewis, E. R., *America, Nation or Confusion*, 1928.

²⁹ Among the books are Clark, Jane P., *Deportation of Aliens from the United States to Europe*, 1931; National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, *The Administration of the Deportation Laws of the United States*, Government Printing Office, Washington, 1931; Van Vleck, W. C., *The Administrative Control of Aliens*, 1932.

CHAPTER IV

THE SOCIOLOGY OF WAR AND IMPERIALISM

SINCE war is one of the most important aspects of group conflict, it is to be expected that it would be a theme of major interest to the sociologists. As a matter of fact it has entered largely into sociological discussion since the time of Plato. For the most part sociologists have recognized the evils of war, but they have not always been equally clear as to the possibilities or methods of its abolition. Many classic writers on sociology throughout the world have pointed out the danger of war to civilization. These writers, representing the best of the world's cultures, have made an analysis of war that, for its thoroughness, completeness, and soundness, is difficult to surpass.¹ Under the influence of eighteenth century idealism some of the nineteenth century sociologists looked forward to a time when war would disappear entirely. Herbert Spencer, for example, maintained that war was functionally connected with barbarism and autocracy and that the coming of industrialism would necessarily abolish war, since it would prove to be too destructive for a commercial and industrial society.² A very popular and widely circulated work by one of the leading publicists³ before and after the war, following the argument of Spencer, made propaganda against war on the ground of its anachronistic character, speaking of its so-called benefits as the "great illusion." A sociologist, however, challenged the Spencerian dictum regarding the anachronistic character of war in a paper read before the Western Philosophic Society at Washington University in April, 1916.⁴ In this paper he

¹ See, e. g., Alberdi, Juan B., *El Crimen de la Guerra*, 1874; Gumpłowicz, Ludwig, *Der Rassenkampf*, 1883; Novicow, Jacques, *Les Luites entre Sociétés humaines et leurs Phases successives*, 1893; *War and Its Alleged Benefits*, 1911; Charles, *La Guerre dans les diverses Races humaines*, 1895; Le Bon, Gustave, *The Psychology of the Great War*, 1916; Loria, Achille, *The Economic Causes of War*, 1918; Ferrero, Guglielmo, *The Unity of the World*, 1930.

² *Principles of Sociology*, Part V, Chs. XVII-XIX.

³ Angell, Norman, *The Great Illusion*, 1911.

⁴ Bernard, L. L., "War and the Democratic State," *Amer. Jl. Sociol.*, XXII: 193-202 (Sept., 1916).

pointed out that Spencer's argument was wholly *a priori* and that the modern industrial state actually and historically utilizes war as an adjunct to its imperialistic commercial, industrial, and financial designs, and that this employment of war is as possible in a democratically as in an autocratically controlled state, especially if population is allowed to outrun the means of subsistence.

Recent American sociologists generally have not shared the eighteenth and nineteenth century optimism of Spencer regarding war. Lester F. Ward connected war with robbery and treated it as a phase of the human struggle for existence.⁵ Modern peoples feel the necessity of urging a more ethical and socially acceptable motive for going to war than mere aggrandizement, but the results are the same. Modern wars are fought, not for immediate plunder and spoils, but for territory, commercial advantages, and for politico-economic powers.⁶ Thus Ward stated, in essence, the theory of economic imperialism as early as 1883. He also criticized the theory of preparedness, pointing out the fallacy of standing armies for protective purposes. Armies really serve the interests of ruling classes, and not those of the masses of the people. Whichever way the war goes, whoever invades or defends, the people lose.⁷ However, in spite of this fact, it is not an easy matter to abolish war. The fears of man have to be taken into consideration. It is too much to expect that any people would allow their territory to be invaded and their property to be destroyed without resistance. Nonresistance would be fatal. If the peace-reformers wish to abolish war they must teach the aggressors that there is no profit to war, and until they can do this the threat of resistance will remain the chief preventive of aggressive wars.⁸

⁵ *Sociology*, 1883, I: 584; II: 70.

⁶ *Ibid.*, I: 584-585; also *Pure Sociology*, 1903, p. 203.

⁷ *Dynamic Sociology*, II: 236-237.

⁸ *Ibid.*, I: 684. It was Norman Angell's purpose in *The Great Illusion*, to teach the aggressor peoples the futility of war and thus prevent war, in the manner here suggested by Ward.

William Graham Sumner was even less hopeful than Ward regarding the ultimate abolition of war. He believed that primitive man was a peaceful animal.⁹ War is a product of the conditions of human life. It has always existed and there is no reason to expect that it will ever cease.¹⁰ There has never been anything noble in the motives to war. Men have always fought for greed, superstition, and the sordid and unidealistic things of life, but the results in human social organization and discipline have often been better than the motives to strife.¹¹ War has been a powerful stimulus to the inventive faculties of man and to racial achievement, but these results have been purchased at a fearful waste of life and capital which has slowed up the evolution of civilization.¹² Men still love war, especially if they are not compelled to do regular military service, as they are in Europe.¹³ Our country has had an unusual opportunity to develop normally without war and under the beneficent influence of peace. It was the ideal of the founders of our country that we should so develop; but we have deliberately thrown away this opportunity and have entered upon a policy of imperialism, of conquest, and misery.¹⁴ Sumner recognizes the influence of population pressure upon national expansion.¹⁵ War offers only a crude and untrustworthy selection of men and institutions.¹⁶ War never is the preferable way of settling difficulties, and is only a crude makeshift to be used as a last resort. In fact a politician who promotes war as a regular method of solving social questions is a criminal.¹⁷ Yet he does not believe that universal peace is possible. If we could abolish international wars by an expansion of social groups we should only transfer war to within the group and substitute civil struggles.¹⁸ Might always has and always will make things right.¹⁹ Sumner also points out the fallacy of pre-

⁹ *War and Other Essays*, 1911, p. 3 (essay here quoted, first published, 1903).

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 15.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 16.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 29.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 27, 291, 297 ff.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 305-306.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 32.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 35.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 35-36.

¹⁹ *Folkways*, 1906, p. 65.

paredness and cites the experience of European countries as evidence of his contention. He sagely remarks that we shall get what we prepare for.²⁰ Many of Sumner's smaller writings and lectures were in opposition to our growing policy of imperialism.

We may now turn to the later and contemporary sociologists and present their views on war and imperialism in definite order. First, let us examine the causes of war as stated by the sociologists. These are many and are variously classified by different sociological writers. Beach, for example, would group all causes of war under either (1) psychological emotionalism or (2) the interests of particular subsidiary groups within the national life. He thinks, in other words, that war rests either upon traditional sentiments or business and class interests, and that the former aid the latter.²¹ This is equivalent to saying that the economic causes are primary and the psycho-social are derivative. Gillin's classification is very similar, the causes he mentions being economic imperialism and cultural imperialism, with a large emphasis upon the role of the leader in war.²² Sumner mentioned four classes of causes of war: hunger, love, vanity, and fear of superior powers.²³ Davie, following closely after Sumner, states the four major categories of causes of war somewhat more concretely as economic motives, desire for women, desire for glory, and religious motivation.²⁴ For purposes of our discussion it seems desirable to group the various concrete causes of war under such major general headings as (1) population pressures, (2) clash of economic interests and imperialism, (3) cultural conflict, and (4) various psychological motivations. Even these general categories of causation are not always distinct, but overlap one another at various points and under certain conditions.

Population pressure is frequently mentioned as one of the

²⁰ *War and Other Essays*, pp. 39-40.

²¹ Beach, W. G., *Social Aims in a Changing World*, 1932, p. 97.

²² Gillin, J. L., *Social Pathology*, 1933, pp. 426-427.

²³ Sumner, W. G., *War and Other Essays*, p. 14.

²⁴ Davie, M. B., *The Evolution of War*, 1929, p. 65.

underlying or basic causes of war.²⁵ In early times the overpopulation of a territory frequently led the people of that region to make raids upon neighboring peoples, who might be better supplied than they with the means of subsistence.²⁶ The raids of the Scotch Highlanders upon the Lowlanders are the best modern illustration of the working of this sort of cause in war, but early and frontier histories are full of examples.²⁷ As Sumner says, men have undertaken war in order to gain hunting territory, for needed supplies, for trade possibilities, for slaves, and even for human flesh.²⁸ The struggle for women, as in the case of the Roman rape of the Sabines, has not been uncommon.²⁹ Migrations in search of food or habitat have also been an effective cause of war.³⁰ Beach declares that the unequal economic resources and development of peoples in relation to population needs are a constant source of struggle.³¹ Bernard has pointed out that while early peoples possessed of more mouths to feed than of food with which to feed them habitually resorted to war directly for the purpose of securing the means of subsistence, modern peoples fight rather for the economic and industrial means with which to produce or obtain food and other essentials of life, i. e., for land, commerce, and raw materials.³² Ross has gone further in the analysis of the evolution of war from the standpoint of population pressure upon the necessities of life. He says that in the hunting stage population pressure resulted in raids and war, while in the agricultural stage of economic development the immediate result of food scarcity was the reduction of new surplus land to cultivation. But in more mature societies, in which the

²⁵ Gillin, Dittmer, and Colbert, *Social Problems*, 1928, pp. 74, 126, 462; Hertzler, J. O., *Social Progress*, 1928, pp. 366-367; Kelsey, Carl, *The Physical Basis of Society*, 1928, p. 241.

²⁶ Ward, L. F., *Pure Sociology*, 1903, pp. 202-203.

²⁷ Ross, E. A., *Principles of Sociology*, 1930, p. 32. See also Kulp, D. H., *Educational Sociology*, 1932, p. 117.

²⁸ Sumner, W. G., *War and Other Essays*, p. 14.

²⁹ *Ibid.*; also *Science of Society*, 1927-1928, I: 363.

³⁰ Hanks, F. H., *Introduction to the Study of Society*, 1928, p. 465; Reinhardt, J. M. and Davies, G. R., *Principles and Methods of Sociology*, 1932, p. 367.

³¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 201-202.

³² *Op. cit.*, pp. 201-202.

supply of free land has been exhausted and in which industrialism overshadows agriculture, the international struggle is renewed, with the objective of conquest of lands, raw materials, markets for their surplus products and loans for their surplus capital. This is, of course, modern economic imperialism.³²

Most sociological writers emphasize especially the economic causes of war.³⁴ We have already seen that Beach considers this the chief or fundamental set of causes. It seems to be rather generally agreed that the economic causes of modern wars are set in the general frame of imperialism. Finney points out that capitalists are continually expanding their business interests, seeking new opportunities for profits through trade and investment. International competition of capitalists ensues, partly through such channels as legislation (protective tariffs) and partly in a more direct manner. International law endeavors to regulate the latter form of capitalistic competition, but it seems never to succeed fully, and sooner or later the capitalists—or rather the masses of the people who are exploited by them through their governments—come to blows. Thus the Great War was the result of the rivalries of British and German capitalism.³⁵ Beach³⁶ and others also emphasize the fact that while the masses and the nation as a whole do not gain by war they bear the brunt of it, and the special interest groups that do gain by war do not usually take an active part in it.³⁷ Veblen further makes the argument that war is inseparable from the present capitalistic-industrial system. He says that the present pecuniary law and order, with their adjuncts of property, investment, business and sabotage, could not survive without the existing warlike preparation and national insecurity. Not only is the whole system of investment and capitalistic exploitation of profits immensely facilitated by wars and threats of wars, but war and war spirit, and

^{32-33.}

^{34.} M., *The Foundations of Social Science*, 1920, p. 204.

^{35.} L., *Elementary Sociology*, 1923, pp. 114-115.

^{36.} *Op. cit.*, p. 102.

^{37.} Veblen, T. B., *The Nature of Peace*, 1917, pp. 24-25.

the accompanying conservatism of the people, are among the very best guarantees of the stability and preservation of the capitalistic system.³⁸ This appears to be a fact well appreciated by the present as well as past national dictators.

Cultural conflict is obviously a secondary category in the causation of wars. Culture itself, considered in the sociological sense, is an outgrowth of the relation of man to his environment and especially of his adjustment to the economic conditions of his survival. Many sociologists,³⁹ in common with the historians, look upon nationalism as a primary cause of war. Nationalism is one of the most outstanding cultural facts, and should be ranked as a secondary cause. Gillin, as we have seen, speaks of cultural imperialism, and we find a good example of it in the German doctrine of *Kultur*. The same cultural basis of belligerency is also to be found in France, in England, Italy, the United States, and all other nations. Closely connected with this spirit of nationalism, which is often fostered by the war-makers as a basis for wars, is the spirit of religious intolerance. Religious antagonism is now but an insignificant cause of war among enlightened peoples, although it was at one time a prolific cause of international strife among many peoples.⁴⁰ Cultural traditions and ideals, the sense of national honor, patriotism, and racial pride are largely interchangeable with the nationalistic attitude as causes of war, and, like nationalism, they are used to camouflage the warlike purposes of the makers of war.⁴¹ Veblen declares that the chief material value of patriotism is to be found in its employment by a limited number of persons to promote their private gain.⁴² This use

³⁸ I., pp. 366-367.

³⁹ See, e. g., Smith, W. R., *Principles of Educational Sociology*, 1928, p. 269; Lumley, F. E., *Principles of Sociology*, 1928, p. 168; Giddings, F. H., *Civilisation and Society*, 1932, p. 150; Parmelee, M., *Blockade and Sea Power*, 1924, p. v.

⁴⁰ Davie, M. R., *op. cit.*, Ch. VIII.

⁴¹ Binder, E. M., *Principles of Sociology*, 1928, pp. 257-258; Ellwood, C. A., *The Social Problem*, 1915, pp. 43-44; Veblen, T. B., *The Nature of Peace*, pp. 23-24; Beach, W. G., *An Introduction to Sociology and Social Problems*, 1925, p. 127; Bogardus, E. S., *Fundamentals of Social Psychology*, 1924, pp. 313-315; Bushae, F. A., *Principles of Sociology*, 1923, p. 122; Blackmar, F. W., *Justifiable Individualism*, 1922, p. 107.

⁴² Veblen, T. B., *op. cit.*, p. x.

of patriotism was given the term patrioteering at the close of the Great War. Veblen further states that war is made honorable in the eyes of the masses by a variety of tricks, such as ceremonials, uniforms, pomp, power, and rituals. War enthusiasm is essentially an upper class fact, for the masses know that they suffer from war. However, in a warlike and strongly nationalistic culture, they catch the clannish and predatory spirit which replaces the ideal of equitable, everyday serviceability among a peace loving people.⁴⁸ Thus ignorance and hatreds are made to play their role among the cultural causes of war.⁴⁴

Many sociologists have emphasized the part played by propaganda in the precipitation of war. Sumner and Keller testify to the influence of yellow journalism in this connection.⁴⁵ Kimball Young⁴⁶ devotes several pages to an analysis of the use of propaganda in connection with war, arranging his treatment under the headings of Propaganda for Those at Home, Propaganda for the Neutrals, and Propaganda Against the Enemy. Folsom points out in some detail the superiority and greater skill of Allied over German propaganda in the Great War.⁴⁷ Lasswell has made a detailed study of propaganda methods used in the World War.⁴⁸ Lumley describes the propaganda devices used in the enlisting of recruits.⁴⁹ Gault gives an interesting account of the methods used in whipping up flagging morale during the World War.⁵⁰ Ross points out that a huge propaganda machine is necessary to arouse enthusiasm for modern wars.⁵¹ Hart claims that even fraudulent propaganda has been employed as a method of playing upon the emotional antagonisms of peoples in order to put

⁴⁴ Veblen, T. B., *Theory of the Leisure Class*, 1899, pp. 247-273.

⁴⁵ Jones, T. J., *Essentials of Civilization*, 1929, pp. xxv, 19, 43; Beach, W. G., *op. cit.*, pp. 93-94.

⁴⁶ *Science of Society*, I: 367.

⁴⁷ *Social Psychology*, 1930, pp. 660-673.

⁴⁸ Folsom, J. K., *Social Psychology*, 1931, pp. 453-454.

⁴⁹ Lasswell, H. D., *Propaganda Technique in the World War*, 1927.

⁵⁰ Lumley, F. E., *The Propaganda Menace*, 1933, pp. 192-194.

⁵¹ Gault, R. H., *Social Psychology*, 1923, pp. 192-199.

⁵² Ross, E. A., *Principles of Sociology*, 1930, p. 69.

them into a state of mind receptive to war.⁵³ Hayes is even more explicit. He says that war has been glorified by the classes and persons profiting from it. They have developed a cult of war, declaring it to be inevitable, normal and desirable.⁵⁴ Veblen declares that it was successful wars, constantly advertised, warlike preparation, and indoctrination of the people with warlike arrogance and ambitions which kept the German allegiance to their predatory theory of the state so long intact.⁵⁵ The same might be said equally well of the policies of other warlike states. Barnes has a most illuminating analysis of the manner in which historical writing and history teaching in the schools of modern nations have been utilized to create strong national antagonisms and to support war policies.⁵⁶ The Great War has undoubtedly had a marked effect upon the sociological theory of war. It has greatly stimulated the interest of the sociologists in the study of war propaganda techniques and results.

The discussion of propaganda in connection with war leads over to the subject of the psychological motivation of war. If the cultural causes of war are secondary, surely the psychological factors are even more derivative, or even tertiary. Most prominent among these, perhaps, is fear.⁵⁶ The desire for revenge is also a strong motive.⁵⁷ Hayes speaks of a "heritage of hate," such as that cherished by European countries that have frequently despoiled one another of territory, as a powerful cause of war.⁵⁸ Such a psychic factor is also obviously cultural. War itself becomes a cult to be passed on from generation to generation to poison the minds of the people and to stir them to violence with its ritual.⁵⁹ The Yale school

⁵³ Hart, Hornell, *Science of Social Relations*, 1927, p. 296.

⁵⁴ Hayes, E. C., *Sociology*, 1930, pp. 708-709.

⁵⁵ Veblen, T. B., *Imperial Germany and the Industrial Revolution*, 1915, p. 78.

⁵⁶ *History and Social Intelligence*, 1926, pp. 285-293.

⁵⁷ Bogardus, E. S., *op. cit.*, pp. 321-324; Bushee, F. A., *op. cit.*, p. 122; Hertzler, J. O., *op. cit.*, pp. 366-367.

⁵⁸ Lumley, F. E., *Means of Social Control*, 1925, p. 383; Davie, M. R., *op. cit.*, p. 121.

⁵⁹ Hayes, E. C., *op. cit.*, p. 709; also Beach, W. G., *Social Aims in a World*, p. 93.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, also Lumley, F. E., *Principles of Sociology*, 1928, p. 168.

of sociologists have emphasized especially the influence of the idea of glory in promoting war.⁶⁰ Women, especially in primitive or barbaric societies, often incite men to war by appealing to their love of glory or sense of shame. Thus women become an effective cause of war.⁶¹ Vanity also plays its part, especially when it is coupled with a reputation for valor or is joined with a desire to stand well with the females.⁶² Ambition has been an especially strong driving force with professional warriors and conquerors.⁶³ Even prestige and self-respect may have to be maintained by force of arms.⁶⁴ Prejudice, ignorance, egoism, even a neurotic or contentious personality, and many other psychic attitudes may be contributing causes of war.⁶⁵ Kulp stresses the suggestibility factor in war when he declares that armies and navies and war groups generally are organized crowds dominated by an intolerant, sectarian morale.⁶⁶ Edwards says that this crowd spirit is often stirred up deliberately by the war-making diplomatists, sometimes with the object of diverting popular attention from unsavory or strained conditions at home.⁶⁷ Gillin says that such war irritants as secret diplomacy and armaments should be abolished.⁶⁸ Beach believes that diplomatic manufacture of war spirit will prove to be a boomerang in the future, resulting in revolution at home rather than in war abroad.⁶⁹

A number of sociologists have been inclined to say that war is, in part at least, a product of human nature, meaning sometimes by human nature instinctive rather than acquired impulses. In this opinion they appear to agree with the social psychologist McDougall, who speaks of a fighting instinct.⁷⁰

⁶⁰ Sumner and Keller, *op. cit.*, I: 263.

⁶¹ Davie, M. R., *op. cit.*, p. 101.

⁶² *Ibid.*, pp. 149-157.

⁶³ Bushee, F. A., *op. cit.*, p. 122.

⁶⁴ Groves, E. R., *An Introduction to Sociology*, 1928, p. 150.

⁶⁵ Bogardus, E. S., *op. cit.*, pp. 813-815; Jones, T. J., *op. cit.*, p. 19; Hart, H., *Technique of Social Progress*, 1931, p. 7.

⁶⁶ Kulp, D. H., *op. cit.*, p. 309; also Hayes, E. C., *op. cit.*, p. 706.

⁶⁷ Edwards, L. F., *The Natural History of Evolution*, 1927, p. 48.

⁶⁸ *Op. cit.*, p. 448.

⁶⁹ *Op. cit.*, p. 104.

⁷⁰ McDougall, W., *An Introduction to Social Psychology*, 2d ed., pp. 286-292.

Park and Burgess appear to take a similar point of view.⁷¹ Ellwood, Hankins, Veblen, and others are even more closely in agreement with McDougall in proclaiming a pugnacious instinct.⁷² Cooley, Angell, and Carr reject an instinct of pugnacity, but maintain that war is rooted in instinctive tendencies.⁷³ Other sociologists deny that war has any special instinctive basis and maintain that fighting must be learned quite as much as any other behavior pattern.⁷⁴ Ross⁷⁵ formerly accepted the hypothesis of a fighting instinct, as did also Bogardus.⁷⁶ Ross now rejects the theory of an instinctive basis of war and explains war as a social habit.⁷⁷ Bernard has discussed the matter in considerable detail and has reduced the arguments in support of an instinctive basis of war to a logical and factual absurdity.⁷⁸

Although most of the sociologists now reject the theory of a pugnacious instinct, they are pretty nearly unanimous in holding that men may be trained to delight in war, the fighting impulse thus coming to be a phase of man's acquired, as distinguished from his instinctive, human nature. W. R. Smith observes that war brings to the surface man's baser instincts, habits, and passions.⁷⁹ Hayes describes war as an emotional orgy.⁸⁰ Davie claims that men often fight for the mere love of excitement and for the joy of fighting, that they do not have to be angry to fight, but will fight for the fun of it or to escape from monotony. He is inclined to think that primitive men in particular often sought diversion from an uninteresting life in this

⁷¹ *Introduction to the Science of Sociology*, 1921, p. 577.

⁷² Ellwood, C. A., *Sociology in Its Psychological Aspects*, 1912, pp. 216-218; Veblen, T. B., *Theory of the Leisure Class*, 1899, pp. 246-248; Hankins, F. H., *op. cit.*, p. 76; Dealey, J. Q., *Sociology: Its Development and Applications*, 1921, pp. 150-151.

⁷³ *Introductory Sociology*, 1933, p. 32.

⁷⁴ Bernard, L. L., *An Introduction to Social Psychology*, 1926, p. 133; Reinhardt and Davies, *op. cit.*, p. 245; Beach, W. G., *Social Aims in a Changing World*, p. 98.

⁷⁵ *Outlines of Sociology*, 1923, pp. 38-39.

⁷⁶ *Essentials of Social Psychology*, 1923.

⁷⁷ *Principles of Sociology*, 1930, p. 69.

⁷⁸ *Instinct, a Study in Social Psychology*, 1924, Ch. XIII; see also Folsom, J. K., *Culture and Social Progress*, 1928, pp. 39-40.

⁷⁹ *Principles of Educational Sociology*, 1928, p. 277.

⁸⁰ *Op. cit.*, p. 708; see also Hart, H., *Science of Social Relations*, p. 191.

way. He compares hunting, herding, and warfare as interesting primitive occupations.⁸¹ MacIver, however, denies that modern war serves as such a release.⁸² Beach finds that war emotionalism is an anachronism in the modern world.⁸³ Case says that war is the product of a socially infantile mind.⁸⁴

The sociologists are divided on the subject of the inevitability of war. Hart reminds us that bloody and brutal warfare has been a chronic evil in society from the remotest human times and quotes Hendrik Van Loon to show that war is now more frequent than ever before.⁸⁵ We have already cited Sumner to the effect that war has always existed and always will exist. Other sociologists are more hopeful. Veblen finds that war is more a modern than a primitive phenomenon.⁸⁶ Davie predicts that war will diminish as larger peace groups appear in the world.⁸⁷ Hayes points out that war is now recognized as a crime in theory and that the cult of peace tends to overcome that of war.⁸⁸ He says the time will come when any great war will be impossible and that we could readily devise a system in which war would be an imbecile situation.⁸⁹ Edwards argues that war is now in a period of excessive development and threatens to destroy the nations unless checked. He therefore predicts that it will in time be relegated to a museum of ancient horrors to keep company with cannibalism and other discontinued social practices.⁹⁰ Cooley, Angell, and Carr hold that, since war is the product of the defects of our social system rather than of a defective human nature, war can

⁸¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 147; see also Sumner, *War and Other Essays*, p. 29; Groves, E. R., *An Introduction to Sociology*, 1928, pp. 151-152.

⁸² MacIver, R. M., *Society: Its Structure and Changes*, 1931, p. 206.

⁸³ *Social Aims in a Changing World*, p. 98.

⁸⁴ Case, C. M., *Social Process and Human Progress*, 1931, p. 146.

⁸⁵ Hart, H., *The Technique of Social Progress*, p. 473; see also Bushee, F. A., *Principles of Sociology*, 1928, p. 13; Dawson, C. A., and Gettys, W. E., *Introduction to Sociology*, 1928, pp. 349, 355; Dealey, J. Q. and Ward, L. F., *A Textbook of Sociology*, 1905, p. 197.

⁸⁶ *Theory of the Leisure Class*, pp. 18-19.

⁸⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 218; see also Dunlap, Knight, *Social Psychology*, 1925, pp. 143-145.

⁸⁸ *Op. cit.*, pp. 706, 709.

⁸⁹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 11-13.

be abolished and that it is our problem to destroy war before it destroys our civilization.⁹¹ We have already stated Beach's theory that future forced wars will result in internal revolution. He believes that this fact will be a marked factor in ending wars, since it will place the aggressor nation at a disadvantage.⁹² Gillin seems to be hopeful even of disarmament and speaks of the growth of an international culture and a world citizenship as inevitable enemies of war.⁹³

It is clear from the literature that there has been a changed attitude on the part of sociologists toward war, especially since the time of the Great War. Before this war some of the older sociologists were sufficiently tolerant to mention certain of the benefits of war,⁹⁴ although we have not found any sociologist of standing who held the benefits to be in excess of the evils. Among the more or less neutral results of war are mentioned the creation of class and caste distinctions⁹⁵ and the intensification of state activity. One of the theories of the origin of the state is that it is the product of conquest and internal predation.⁹⁶ Davie says that war promotes migration and race mixture and cultural exchange, that it both promotes and retards cultural advance, and that it strengthens the internal organization of society and multiplies social structure.⁹⁷ Ross finds that war creates kingships and unsettles class relationships.⁹⁸ War also increases social mobility.⁹⁹

Among the supposed good effects of war Davie mentions the diffusion of useful culture, discipline, the stimulation of science and invention, the promotion of the cooperative spirit within

⁹¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 284.

⁹² *Social Aims in a Changing World*, p. 104.

⁹³ *Op. cit.*, p. 443.

⁹⁴ See, e. g., Sumner, W. G., *War and Other Essays*, pp. 30-34; Blackmar, F. W., *Elements of Sociology*, 1905, p. 59; Blackmar and Gillin, *Outlines of Sociology*, 1915, p. 65.

⁹⁵ Sumner, W. G., *War and Other Essays*, p. 30; Cooley, Angell, and Carr, *op. cit.*, p. 292.

⁹⁶ Ross, E. A., *Principles of Sociology*, 1930, p. 151.

⁹⁷ *Op. cit.*, pp. 218-233. See also Edwards, L. P., *op. cit.*, p. 12; Snedden, D., *Educational Sociology*, 1924, pp. 106-108.

⁹⁸ *Principles of Sociology*, 1930, pp. 478-479.

⁹⁹ Sorokin, P. A., *Social Mobility*, 1927, p. 466.

the nation, the selection of more vigorous physical types and superior social patterns,¹⁰⁰ and the stimulation of public health measures in modern nations.¹⁰¹ Ross claims that a defensive struggle sometimes gives an oppressed class a chance to rise because of the need for its services.¹⁰²

Several writers also declare that war was once useful to society, but with changing social conditions has ceased to be an advantage and has become a positive detriment. Bushee says that the benefits from war tend to diminish as civilization progresses.¹⁰³ Dealey thinks war is a necessary evil which formerly served a useful purpose, that is, of promoting social integration, selecting the strong, and of adjusting population to the food supply.¹⁰⁴ Hankins thinks that war was once a powerful stimulus to innovation and cultural change, but that it is now more destructive than constructive.¹⁰⁵

The evil effects of war mentioned are more numerous. Gillin speaks of the great destruction of human life, the great economic losses, the dysgenic effects upon the population, increasing social disorganization, the increase of poverty and dependency, the upset of the emotional balance of the people, the increase of crime, the stimulation of mental disease, the unsettling of sex morals, the increased distrust of other nations, and international hatred.¹⁰⁶ Cooley, Angell, and Carr intimate that war has prevented the European peasants from developing great breeds of domestic cattle, has lowered the French stature by two inches, that it diminishes the number of non-military inventions, dislocates the educational and social services of the nation, disorganizes the world market after the war, takes a disproportionate amount of the national revenue long after hostilities are over, lowers the standard of living, in-

¹⁰⁰ *Op. cit.*, pp. 221-230; also Sumner, W. G., *War and Other Essays*, pp. 30-35.

¹⁰¹ *Problems of City Life*, 1932, p. 213.

¹⁰² *Principles of Sociology*, 1930, p. 478.

¹⁰³ *Principles of Sociology*, p. 135.

¹⁰⁴ *Sociology: Its Development and Applications*, p. 151. See also Groves, *op. cit.*, pp. 149-151.

¹⁰⁵ *Id.*

op. cit., pp. 432-440.

creases social unrest, and stimulates to revolution and radicalism.¹⁰⁷ W. R. Smith adds to the evil effects of war the following: the breakdown of institutional effectiveness, the slowing up of the normal forms of scientific research, artistic production, literature and the drama. After the war comes a period of degeneracy, corrupt politics, economic exploitation of the masses, religious reversion, and the distortion of aesthetic and social standards, threatening even to overthrow the structure of civilization and sometimes actually producing this result.¹⁰⁸ Carpenter states that war is especially destructive to modern city life and mentions as evidence the effects of the Great War upon European cities.¹⁰⁹ An interesting contradiction in the theory of the national correlates of city life is presented by the case of Carpenter, who asserts that urbanism is associated with nationalism and imperialism,¹¹⁰ and Sorokin and Zimmerman, who conclude that urban populations are more international in character, while rural populations are more nationalistic and patriotic.¹¹¹ Veblen says that the most important loss during war is the loss of morale for peaceful pursuits.¹¹² Devine states that war accustoms us to violence, cultivates the sadistic impulses and stimulates crime.¹¹³ Lumley reminds us that defeat stimulates the desire for revenge and thus initiates a vicious circle.¹¹⁴ Ross adds that war and militarism depress the condition of women, weaken liberalism and strengthen imperialistic tendencies.¹¹⁵

Imperialism, which is so closely related to war, is now being discussed more fully than previously. Barnes has shown in several volumes the relation of modern imperialism to our industrial, commercial, and financial systems. It is a device by

¹⁰⁷ *Op. cit.*, pp. 282-284.

¹⁰⁸ *Op. cit.*, pp. 276-278.

¹⁰⁹ Carpenter, Niles, *The Sociology of City Life*, 1931, pp. 368-373, 460.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 402.

¹¹¹ *Principles of Rural-Urban Sociology*, 1929, pp. 407, 412, 474.

¹¹² *Imperial Germany and the Industrial Revolution*, p. 267.

¹¹³ Devine, E. T., *Social Work*, 1927, pp. 178-180.

¹¹⁴ *Means of Social Control*, p. 383.

¹¹⁵ *Principles of Sociology*, 1930, pp. 197, 579.

the nation, the selection of more vigorous physical types and superior social patterns,¹⁰⁰ and the stimulation of public health measures in modern nations.¹⁰¹ Ross claims that a defensive struggle sometimes gives an oppressed class a chance to rise because of the need for its services.¹⁰²

Several writers also declare that war was once useful to society, but with changing social conditions has ceased to be an advantage and has become a positive detriment. Bushee says that the benefits from war tend to diminish as civilization progresses.¹⁰³ Dealey thinks war is a necessary evil which formerly served a useful purpose, that is, of promoting social integration, selecting the strong, and of adjusting population to the food supply.¹⁰⁴ Hankins thinks that war was once a powerful stimulus to innovation and cultural change, but that it is now more destructive than constructive.¹⁰⁵

The evil effects of war mentioned are more numerous. Gillin speaks of the great destruction of human life, the great economic losses, the dysgenic effects upon the population, increasing social disorganization, the increase of poverty and dependency, the upset of the emotional balance of the people, the increase of crime, the stimulation of mental disease, the unsettling of sex morals, the increased distrust of other nations, and international hatred.¹⁰⁶ Cooley, Angell, and Carr intimate that war has prevented the European peasants from developing great breeds of domestic cattle, has lowered the French stature by two inches, that it diminishes the number of non-military inventions, dislocates the educational and social services of the nation, disorganizes the world market after the war, takes a disproportionate amount of the national revenue long after hostilities are over, lowers the standard of living, in-

¹⁰⁰ *Op. cit.*, pp. 221-230; also Sumner, W. G., *War and Other Essays*, pp. 30-35.

¹⁰¹ *Problems of City Life*, 1932, p. 213.

¹⁰² *Principles of Sociology*, 1930, p. 478.

¹⁰³ *Principles of Sociology*, p. 135.

¹⁰⁴ *Sociology: Its Development and Applications*, p. 151. See also Groves, *op. cit.*, pp. 149-151.

¹⁰⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 422.

¹⁰⁶ *Op. cit.*, pp. 432-440.

creases social unrest, and stimulates to revolution and radicalism.¹⁰⁷ W. R. Smith adds to the evil effects of war the following: the breakdown of institutional effectiveness, the slowing up of the normal forms of scientific research, artistic production, literature and the drama. After the war comes a period of degeneracy, corrupt politics, economic exploitation of the masses, religious reversion, and the distortion of aesthetic and social standards, threatening even to overthrow the structure of civilization and sometimes actually producing this result.¹⁰⁸ Carpenter states that war is especially destructive to modern city life and mentions as evidence the effects of the Great War upon European cities.¹⁰⁹ An interesting contradiction in the theory of the national correlates of city life is presented by the case of Carpenter, who asserts that urbanism is associated with nationalism and imperialism,¹¹⁰ and Sorokin and Zimmerman, who conclude that urban populations are more international in character, while rural populations are more nationalistic and patriotic.¹¹¹ Veblen says that the most important loss during war is the loss of morale for peaceful pursuits.¹¹² Devine states that war accustoms us to violence, cultivates the sadistic impulses and stimulates crime.¹¹³ Lumley reminds us that defeat stimulates the desire for revenge and thus initiates a vicious circle.¹¹⁴ Ross adds that war and militarism depress the condition of women, weaken liberalism and strengthen imperialistic tendencies.¹¹⁵

Imperialism, which is so closely related to war, is now being discussed more fully than previously. Barnes has shown in several volumes the relation of modern imperialism to our industrial, commercial, and financial systems. It is a device by

¹⁰⁷ *Op. cit.*, pp. 282-284.

¹⁰⁸ *Op. cit.*, pp. 276-278.

¹⁰⁹ Carpenter, Niles, *The Sociology of City Life*, 1931, pp. 368-378, 460.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 402.

¹¹¹ *Principles of Rural-Urban Sociology*, 1929, pp. 407, 412, 474.

¹¹² *Imperial Germany and the Industrial Revolution*, p. 267.

¹¹³ Devine, E. T., *Social Work*, 1927, pp. 178-180.

¹¹⁴ *Means of Social Control*, p. 383.

¹¹⁵ *Principles of Sociology*, 1930, pp. 197, 579.

which the economic resources of weaker peoples are exploited by the economic rulers of the stronger peoples.¹¹⁶ Ross emphasizes the same point,¹¹⁷ but also says that the white race serves as a midwife to the black and brown races.¹¹⁸ He also says that the whites, in stimulating the population and cultural growth of the darker races in order to profit from their labor and trade, have raised up formidable competitors for themselves in the future.¹¹⁹ Economic imperialism inevitably expands social structure to correspond to the scope of economic activity and structure in our modern world.¹²⁰ MacIver thinks it is tragic that the white races have destroyed the communal spirit of the primitive races and have imposed upon them their vices.¹²¹

¹¹⁶ Davis, Barnes, *et al.*, *Introduction to Sociology*, 1927, pp. 180-181.

¹¹⁷ *Principles of Sociology*, 1930, p. 204.

¹¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 24.

¹¹⁹ Cooley, Angell, and Carr, *op. cit.*, pp. 278-279; Beach, W. G., *Social Aims in a Changing World*, p. 106.

CHAPTER V

PEACE AND PEACEFUL RELATIONS

SOCIOLOGISTS, as well as others, have sought the key to the abolition of war. Stratton is convinced that no nation or state today wishes war for itself. Nations go to war only because their rulers believe it is the most effective means by which to get what they do want—territory, economic advantages, security, peace, or whatever it may be.¹ Thus, the absence of a more satisfactory device for national defense or advancement perpetuates war.² Among these substitutes for war, Stratton mentions international organizations, such as the Permanent Court of Arbitration, The Hague Conferences, the League of Nations, the International Labor Organization, the Permanent Court of International Justice, the Committee of Experts for the Progressive Codification of International Law, and various other international committees and unions.³ He believes that the crowd psychologists also could do much for the abolition of war by controlling war hysteria and by uniting to direct the spirit of war into a love for and a confidence in the benefits of peace.⁴ A public opinion which is loyal to the means of international justice and a mutual confidence of the peoples in one another, which may be fostered by the publicists, would be powerful in abolishing war and in promoting peace.⁵ Finally, he thinks that national profits must be taken out of war if it is to be abolished.⁶ Veblen and many other sociologists are convinced that private profit is the main root of war and must be removed as the first step toward the abolition of war.⁷ In fact,

¹ Stratton, G. M., *Social Psychology of International Conduct*, 1929, p. 280.

² *Ibid.*, p. 291.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 300-301.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 316-317.

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 333, 345.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 336.

⁷ Veblen, T. B., *The Nature of Peace*, 1917, pp. 366-367; Nearing, Scott, *Dollar Diplomacy*, 1925; Davis, Barnes, *et al.*, *Introduction to Sociology*, 1927, pp. 180-181.

Veblen believes that war is so closely tied up with our whole economic order that nothing can be done toward its abolition until the social order itself is changed.⁸

Gillin groups his proposals for the abolition of war under such headings as international organizations; the development of an international mind free from hatreds, suspicions, jealousies and the intolerance of strange cultures; the control of instruments of propaganda in the interest of peace; the removal of economic barriers to international intercourse; and the removal of war irritants.⁹ He would educate people in all countries for a positive appreciation of the culture of other peoples and promote exchanges of teachers and students and understanding travel and an acquaintance with the best in world literature and art.¹⁰ He further proposes the removal of tariffs, the apportioning among nations of raw materials needed for industry, and the internationalization of foreign loans. He believes that no government should be expected to guarantee the foreign speculations of its bankers and investors.¹¹ By war irritants he means secret diplomacy and competitive armaments. As difficult as it may seem to abolish these two causes of war, Gillin believes that something can be done in this direction if we seek to replace current cynicism in the minds of the young by a new social idealism.¹²

Ross adds to the above proposals for the abolition of war the relinquishment of the liberty to make war.¹³ Parmelee holds that the only way to prevent war and establish peaceful relations among races and peoples on a permanent basis is through the evolution (he does not say the creation) of an international state. He thinks all other methods are useless while rival states contend for private commercial and financial interests.¹⁴ He believes the time of the appearance of such a world state

⁸ *Loc. cit.*

⁹ *Social Pathology*, 1933, pp. 440-443.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 441.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 442.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 443.

¹³ Ross, E. A., *Principles of Sociology*, 1930, p. 165.

¹⁴ *Blockade and Sea Power*, 1924, p. vii.

is far distant.¹⁵ Hayes, however, seems to think that such a state, or at least a federation, can be established by convention on the basis of an international sentiment against war. Such a coalition would oppose the territorial aggrandizement of one people at the expense of another. The supplementary and necessary prerequisite to such a coalition must be a strong international public opinion condemning violence by one nation against another as perfidious. Such a public opinion, he recognizes, can develop only among a people which has freed itself of bigotry and has adopted an international attitude.¹⁶ Davis believes that efforts against war are slowly increasing in effectiveness.¹⁷

Sociologists, as we have shown in Chapter II, have given much more attention to war and conflict than to peace and the conditions of peace. But interest in the nature and technology of peace is growing among the sociologists. Thus Veblen, in treating this subject, states that his inquiry is into the nature, causes and consequences of the ideal of peace and the conditions that favor the ideal of war.¹⁸ Park and Burgess seem convinced that peace quite as much as war requires a sociological analysis and they devote considerable space to a statement of Simmel's theory of the transition from war to peace.¹⁹ Sumner and Keller find that there is a persistent trend toward peace as the in-group or well-organized cooperating or national group increases in size, as it tends to do under modern industrial and economic conditions with their strong emphasis upon widespread contacts and communication.²⁰ Thus imperialism itself may be a promoter of peace.²¹ Giddings, for example, thinks that war will cease only when small states have been absorbed into the great democratic empires.²²

¹⁵ *Criminology*, 1926 (1918), p. 99.

¹⁶ *Sociology*, 1930, pp. 710-711.

¹⁷ Davis, Jerome, *Contemporary Social Movements*, 1930, p. 753.

¹⁸ *The Nature of Peace*, p. 3.

¹⁹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 703-706.

²⁰ *Op. cit.*, I: 397. See also Sumner, W. G., *Folkways*, 1906, pp. 499-500.

²¹ Barnes, H. E., in Duggan, S. P., ed., *The League of Nations*, 1919, p. 174; also Hanks, F. H., *Introduction to the Study of Society*, 1928, p. 518.

²² *Democracy and Empire*, 1901, pp. v, 344, 357.

Davie presents an extensive discussion of "the stress toward peace," in which he contends that the extension of peace may be due to such factors as intermarriage, trade, primitive secret societies, religion, the concept of blood brotherhood, guest friendship, or alliances. Under primitive conditions these factors are made to operate over ever widening circles until finally peace becomes coterminous with the state, which he regards as the peace group par excellence.²³ A number of sociologists have imagined a similar widening of the circle of peace in modern world society with a tendency for it to embrace a world state. These tendencies will be discussed later under the heading of international organization.

Several points of view have been expressed by sociologists as to the nature of peace. Many of them do not regard it as a thing in itself, but as a phase of, or even as an interlude in, the development of war. Park and Burgess describe peace as a form of accommodation, which in turn they define as the natural issue of conflicts. For the time being the hostile or contending elements are regulated and overt conflict disappears, although it probably continues underground as a latent emotional or even political force. Any kind of open conflict will sooner or later issue in a new accommodation or social adjustment based upon a readjustment of the relations of the parties to the conflict. This is what we mean by peace, they think, and quite clearly it is not permanent.²⁴ Veblen takes a similar view, possibly originated the view, regarding peace as merely an armistice.²⁵ Sumner, following Spencer, holds that there is an essential bond between industrial organization and peace.²⁶ But H. A. Miller points out that the occident has discovered that economic and mechanical advancement do not necessarily promote peace.²⁷ Some of the sociologists make a more constructive analysis of peace. Hornell Hart, for

²³ *The Evolution of War*, 1929, pp. 196-218.

²⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 665.

²⁵ *The Nature of Peace*, p. 7.

²⁶ *War and Other Essays*, 1911, p. 28.

²⁷ *The Beginnings of Tomorrow*, 1933, p. 21.

example, finds two motivations in pacifism: one taking the negative aspect of nonresistance and the other the positive and active form of a struggle for the abolition of war.²⁸ The sociologists are divided between these two criteria of achieving peace, some being satisfied with the former procedure,²⁹ while others are decidedly activists, believing that peace is not a plum that falls into one's mouth as he lies star-gazing, or a fore-ordained event or condition which will proceed from a metaphysical or natural order of the universe. For example, Hayes, in his discussion of the psychology of peace, points out that peace demands just as great, if not greater, devotion, courage, and constancy as does war, and also that the so-called heroic virtues are as essential to peace as to war.³⁰ This conception of peace takes it out of the negative category of an interlude between wars and gives it a positive significance which promises to build it into as definite an institutional status as now pertains to war.

Some sociologists have discussed the conditions of peace. In addition to the more objective conditions outlined in connection with the problem of the abolition of war, many of the educational sociologists especially lay stress on the psychological conditions necessary for peace. Thus Peters holds that in the future of mankind peace will be dependent largely upon mutual trust and a sympathetic understanding among the world's peoples.³¹ In order to develop these attitudes and promote a sense of fundamental spiritual kinship he recommends the study of geography as an important phase of civic education. Finney likewise emphasizes the fact that there can be no international peace as long as we remain in the grip of a war psychology. The masses must achieve new intellectual and emotional attitudes in favor of peace, if it is to be realized.³² W. R.

²⁸ *The Science of Social Relations*, 1927, pp. 237-238.

²⁹ See Miller, H. A., *op. cit.*, pp. 239-241, and Case, C. M., *Non-Violent Coercion*, 1923.

³⁰ *Sociology*, p. 708.

³¹ *Objectives and Procedures in Civic Education*, 1930, p. 183.

Smith also holds that peace depends on mutual understanding among the peoples of the world. Like Peters, he believes that the promotion of this understanding is the function of education and he outlines a program designed for this end.³³ Kulp states that peace must be founded on facts, not fictions. He believes that the accommodation or armistice theory of peace is inadequate for the promotion of a lasting peace and for internationalism. There must be developed universal sentiments to support it. World peace also demands tolerance and it is one of the functions of the school to maintain social, political, national, religious, and economic tolerances.³⁴ Barnes emphasizes the necessity of writing history truthfully, so as to give the actual facts about the military, economic, political, and diplomatic relations of each country. He thinks that such a history would prevent the development of a false and jingoistic patriotism which serves as an excellent soil for war propaganda.³⁵ Gillin also recognizes the importance of psychological factors as conditions of peace. He suggests that in every country efforts should be made to control the instruments of propaganda in the interests of peace.³⁶ Veblen, on the other hand, is of the opinion that polemical propaganda cannot serve the cause of peace and amity any more than a vigorous warlike preparation which professes to aim at keeping the peace.³⁷

Interestingly enough it is a set of psychic attitudes that have perhaps done most to stand in the way of the realization of peace by perpetuating nationalism and preventing a wider world organization. Bernard has defined nationality as a collective consciousness of the unity of the group along the lines of common language, culture, customs, traditions, conventions, religion, belief, and possibly even a common race conscious-

³³ *Principles of Educational Sociology*, 1928, pp. 279-289. This program includes informal education through international contacts, propaganda, formal education through the schools, comprising international civics, exchange of teachers, exchange of educational ideas, Good-Will Day, etc.

³⁴ *Educational Sociology*, 1932, pp. 288, 312.

³⁵ *History and Social Intelligence*, 1926, pp. 293-294.

³⁶ *Social Pathology*, p. 441.

³⁷ *Imperial Germany and the Industrial Revolution*, 1915, p. 57.

ness.³⁸ It is this common consciousness which cements the peoples bound by rivalries and conflicts that so often lead to war and inhibit peace. Case points out that group selfishness in a nationalistic form has become the real religion of most modern populations and is more binding than Christianity itself.³⁹ He thinks the small nations might set a good example of national unity directed toward the aim of constructive social development instead of toward imperialistic exploitations of other nations, if they did not have to spend so much of their energies in self-protection against the aggressions of the great imperialistic powers. He cites modern Denmark as an example of constructive endeavor at national self-development along legitimate lines.⁴⁰ Binder, however, is not so hopeful about small nationalities. He is of the opinion that they have rarely achieved anything notable and believes that their aims and policies are usually petty. Rarely have they made great discoveries in science or promoted any great cause. Sometimes their poets or professors get the idea that their cultures have had something valuable in them and they work up a national sentiment for the restoration of an inefficient language or for the preservation of an outworn culture and perhaps finally induce some greater power—with an ax to grind—to liberate them. He thinks, however, that the liberators will find themselves poorly repaid for their pains.⁴¹

Park and Burgess say that nationalistic movements represent a struggle for recognition, for honor, glory, and prestige.⁴² To these aims of nationalism Jones adds the demand for self-expression.⁴³ Miller thinks that nationalism has probably reached its climax. Within the last two generations, he says, it has covered the earth. It is essentially a revolt against political and cultural imperialism. It flourishes to best ad-

³⁸ *An Introduction to Social Psychology*, 1926, pp. 240, 241, 484.

³⁹ Case, C. M., *Social Process and Human Progress*, 1931, p. 14.

⁴⁰ Binder, R. M., *Major Social Problems*, 1920, pp. 216-218.

⁴¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 579.

⁴² *The Essentials of Civilization*, 1929, p. 43.

vantage under repression, and as a consequence it develops an oppression psychosis. He believes it to be a disease, but thinks it must run its course and, unlike Giddings, quoted above, he believes that its cure will be the disappearance of imperialism. He thinks that the drive toward nationalism will not be checked until national freedom for the small peoples has been obtained. The worst thing about this movement, in his opinion, is that idealistic nationalistic sentiment is now exploited by those who have most to gain by international malpractice.⁴⁴ Miller characterizes the feeling of nationality as metaphysical and Cooley, Angell, and Carr call it mystical.⁴⁵ Hankins regards nationality as mythical.⁴⁶

Patriotism is, of course, the ruling sentiment in nationalism. Edwards is of the opinion that mankind has gone off on the wrong foot and wandered up a blind alley in the matter of nationalistic patriotism.⁴⁷ Lumley explains how the schools in most modern nations have been used in propagandizing the people in favor of a false nationalistic patriotism.⁴⁸ He also has an enlightening and searching exposition of the manner in which race propaganda is designed for the purpose of stimulating a belligerent nationalistic patriotism.⁴⁹ In another chapter he exposes the subtle methods used by the war makers and other sinister propagandists in building up and maintaining at fever heat a cheap, jingoistic patriotism that works persistently against the advent of peace.⁵⁰ Giddings, however, defends patriotism, distinguishing it from what the pseudo-social psychologists have called "herd instinct." It is quite clear from his context that Giddings does not mean the cheap, jingoistic patriotism of the militarists and war propagandists, but rather that deeper love of country which causes the true patriot to face frankly his country's errors and inadequacies

⁴⁴ *The Beginnings of Tomorrow*, pp. 45, 48.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 49; Cooley, Angell, and Carr, *Introductory Sociology*, 1933, p. 199.

⁴⁶ *An Introduction to the Study of Society*, p. 726.

⁴⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 12.

⁴⁸ *The Propaganda Menace*, 1933, pp. 303-309.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, Ch. XI.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, Ch. X.

and to reform them even under the pressure of the taunts and menaces of the jingoistic patriots and the patrioteers.⁵¹ Cooley, Angell, and Carr take much the same attitude about patriotism when they point out that if a people are motivated by the higher constructive type of patriotism, nationalism need not be the enemy of peace and internationalism, but rather may come to be the intellectual and emotional bridge over which the transition is made from the small self-seeking national state to the larger socialized world state.⁵² Many sociologists recognize a utility in nationalism in so far as it serves to give a basis for common interests and the motivation to cooperation but hold that its excessive jingoistic emphasis must be guarded against.⁵³ Hart recognizes the need of an inspiring social pattern, but holds that nationalism will not serve this end, because its dynamic motivation is toward war.⁵⁴ Binder is persuaded that nationalism must give way to internationalism.⁵⁵

Veblen is so strongly convinced of the economic drift toward internationalism that he says it is only with great difficulty that industrialism can be prevented from extending across national frontiers.⁵⁶ It seems to be universally agreed among the sociologists that the modern industrial system is responsible for a growing world unity. Cooley, Angell, and Carr find that the nexus through which this world unity is being achieved is the world market.⁵⁷ This world unity extends from the merely economic and industrial over to the cultural, manifesting itself through literatures, art, religions, mores, and especially through science, which constantly approach a more common and unified basic pattern. Practically all of the sociologists agree on these facts, but they are not so sure that this economic and cultural unity will also become political and result in one or more great international states. This failure of the world

⁵¹ *Civilisation and Society*, 1932, pp. 363-367.

⁵² *Op. cit.*, p. 201.

⁵³ Smith, W. B., *op. cit.*, p. 269; MacIver, R. M., *Society*, 1931, p. 69.

⁵⁴ *The Technique of Social Progress*, 1931, p. 478.

⁵⁵ *Major Social Problems*, pp. 224-225.

⁵⁶ *Imperial Germany and the Industrial Revolution*, pp. 234-235.

⁵⁷ *Op. cit.*, pp. 277-278.

state to develop is explained by Cooley, Angell, and Carr on the ground that a state requires external opposition in order to develop sufficient "we" feeling to secure the requisite world unity, and this opposition would be lacking to a world state.⁵⁸ Smith, however, thinks there is a more consciously constructive approach to this wider world unity. He advocates using education for the promotion of a common world consciousness.⁵⁹ Kimball Young, however, doubts that anything worth while can be accomplished by propagandistic myths and the creation of emotional stereotypes in favor of an internationalism that does not come of its own accord.⁶⁰

But the growth of internationalism, as we have seen, is not dependent upon propaganda for its attainment. We have noted the influence of modern industrialism in this connection and the manner in which cultural expansion follows the economic. Spencer and other sociologists were formerly accustomed to speak of this outward cultural movement as the cross-fertilization of cultures. Latterly, the sociologists have adopted the anthropological term diffusion to cover the same idea. Ross declares that diffusion equalizes many diversities of culture resulting from differences of race, geographic environment, and the stage of economic development. He classifies the means of diffusion as trade, migration, warfare, conquest, intermarriage, diplomatic relations, travel, and missions.⁶¹ To the means cited by Ross, Winston adds slavery, fairs, visiting teachers and scholars, colonization, publications, and mechanical devices for communication.⁶² Such factors result in marked social change. Ross regards missions as more powerful than military or political domination in disseminating culture.⁶³ Hankins, however, regards war as the most potent factor here and migrations as a powerful secondary factor.⁶⁴

⁵⁸ *Op. cit.*, p. 201.

⁵⁹ Smith, W. R., *op. cit.*, pp. 268, 275, 278.

⁶⁰ *Social Psychology*, 1930, p. 673.

⁶¹ *Principles of Sociology*, pp. 84-85.

⁶² Winston, Sanford, *Culture and Human Behavior*, 1933, pp. 82-100.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, pp. 504-505.

⁶⁴ *Op. cit.*, pp. 422-423.

Case predicts a rapid break-up of local culture patterns in the near future as the result of modern means of travel, trade and communication, and the substitution of a world cultural unity. He emphasizes especially the influence of the moving picture in this role of diffusion.⁶⁵ Wallis calls attention to the similar influence of radio communication.⁶⁶

Beach is convinced that the world is ready for an advance toward a new unitary political organization, which he seems to think will be a federation of the nations on an analogy with the union of mediaeval cities into national states that came with the development of the commercial revolution.⁶⁷ Dunlap draws an analogy between the federation of primitive tribes, of early smaller states, and the union of modern states on the one hand and the expected federation of modern political units on a world-wide basis for the abolition of war and the promotion of common ends on the other hand. He thinks that the League of Nations may accomplish this end, but if not some other organization will arise to produce the same result.⁶⁸ Many sociologists agree with these views. Case hails the League of Nations as a deliberate, self-conscious attempt on the part of world society to abolish war and promote common interests, but regrets that greed, race hatred, and ignorance have done what they could to make it ineffective.⁶⁹ Hayes complains that the League has too little force at its disposal, but it is not ineffective in adjusting disputes.⁷⁰ Finney says that even voluntary federations must have force at their command in order to accomplish their aims.⁷¹

There seems to be no greater hope or expectation that something in the direction of a stable international organization may be accomplished through an international judiciary and international arbitration, which work even more slowly than

⁶⁵ *Op. cit.*, pp. 282-287.

⁶⁶ Wallis, W. D., *Culture and Progress*, 1930, p. 81.

⁶⁷ *Social Aims in a Changing World*, 1932, p. 106.

⁶⁸ Dunlap, Knight, *Social Psychology*, 1925, pp. 143-145.

⁶⁹ *Social Process and Human Progress*, p. 87.

⁷⁰ *Sociology*, pp. 709-710.

an international administrative organization. Edwards thinks that the elimination of war through international arbitration and courts is but a feeble possibility in the face of our surcharge of nationalistic patriotism.⁷² Mangold says the world court is not enough of a means to peace and that we need to work out solutions of social welfare problems with other countries on a cooperative basis.⁷³ MacIver finds that treaties and other conventions and organs of justice have never been successful over a very long period of time.⁷⁴

Since international law is necessary for the protection of economic rights there is some ground for the hope that it may also become effective in protecting other social interests.⁷⁵ Its great weakness lies in the fact that it is not enforceable and must depend on the consent of the parties involved.⁷⁶ Yet it does help to prevent exploitation.⁷⁷ Hayes points out that war is now a crime.⁷⁸ Jerome Davis gives considerable space to the enumeration of the past achievements of international arbitration and the world court and to the outlawry of war.⁷⁹ A common conception of rights has been growing up in all countries and the attitude is increasing to the effect that these rights should be applied impartially to all peoples.⁸⁰ Finney contends that we need a new international code in morals as well as a new international power to enforce international morality.⁸¹

It seems to be clear, however, from the foregoing that the sociologists are becoming increasingly convinced that war is perhaps now the chief enemy of civilization, and that it must be abolished if civilization is to be preserved or improved. But quite obviously they are not agreed as to how this may be done.

⁷² *Op. cit.*, p. 12.

⁷³ Mangold, G. B., *Social Pathology*, 1932, pp. 8-9.

⁷⁴ *Society*, pp. 208-204.

⁷⁵ Miller, H. A., *op. cit.*, p. 60.

⁷⁶ Cooley, Angell, and Carr, *op. cit.*, p. 284.

⁷⁷ Snedden, D., *Educational Sociology*, 1924, p. 112.

⁷⁸ *Op. cit.*, pp. 813-859.

⁷⁹ Cooley, Angell, and Carr, *op. cit.*, p. 203.

⁸⁰ *Op. cit.*, p. 195.

Some of them seem still to be inclined to think that war will naturally and automatically disappear in the course of social evolution. Others believe that it can be extirpated either by education, by legislation, or by organization directly in opposition to war. Perhaps a growing number of sociologists are becoming convinced that war is an inherent element in our highly competitive capitalistic system, and that the only way to abolish war is to abolish or transform the system.

CHAPTER VI

SOCIOLOGICAL CONCEPTS, VIEWPOINTS, AND INTERPRETATIONS OF VALUE FOR THE STUDY OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

PERHAPS the most outstanding contribution of the sociologists to the study of international relations has been made through the concepts, viewpoints, and interpretations they have worked out in the process of their investigations of social phenomena and which they have made available to the students of international group phenomena and of the relations of groups of different nationals. Since the sociologists have represented a largely new viewpoint in social science, they have developed a number of new approaches which can be utilized by other social sciences. Some of the more important of these for international and foreign nationality relations will be reviewed briefly here, and their authors and possible applications to the field of international relations indicated.

1. The sociologists have specialized considerably in the analysis of groups and of group behavior. The sociologist thinks of the world as constituted of cooperating and competing groups which must find their adjustments through the balancing of behavior and of satisfactions of the types ordinarily studied by the sociologist. To him nations and international relationships, and dynamic group relationships within nations, constitute purely naturalistic processes, while the legal and other conventional relationships treated mainly by the economists and the political scientists are derivative rather than primary in the adjustment process. Cooley's¹ classification of groups as primary and institutional and Bernard's² development in this connection of the concept of derivation and expansion should prove significant for the student of international

¹ Cooley, C. H., *Social Organization*, 1909, Chs. III-V.

² *An Introduction to Social Psychology*, 1926, Chs. ---

relations, since these two interpretations explain the functional differences between primitive and modern international relations. Bernard's distinction between direct and indirect contact groups³ is also of considerable importance for the study of wider group relationships. While politically organized national groups are primarily of an indirect contact character, the smaller nationalistic or immigrant and racial groups located in the midst of large political national groups are almost invariably face-to-face or direct contact groups, frequently clinging together with the tenacity of primary group organizations. Giddings' classification of groups into congregate and aggregate groups is also important for the sociological study of international relations. Primary congregation is, in Giddings' terminology, the coming together of individuals and families, while secondary congregation is the assembling of different nationalities and races, such as occurs in the case of immigration.⁴ We have already referred to Sumner's distinction between the in-group and the out-group.⁵ Nationality groups are always in-groups and treat their own members in a distinctly different manner from that in which they treat the members of out-groups or other nationalities. In immigrant groups located in the midst of large nationalist groups this in-group and out-group distinction is frequently even more marked, because of the closer contacts and greater rivalry between or among groups. The consciousness of such distinctions is often so strong within the in-groups that it results in a marked ethical dualism. H. A. Miller has also distinguished between horizontal and vertical groups,⁶ and has pointed out the social, economic, political, and ethical implications of the classifications. Nationality groups, when organized with a separate political existence, are groups with a

³ *Ibid.*, Chs. XXVIII-XXXI.

⁴ Giddings, F. H., *Elements of Sociology*, 1898, pp. 25-26; also *Principles of Sociology*, 1896, p. 168.

⁵ *Folkways*, 1906, pp. 12-15, 29, 116, 143-144, 148, 263, 331, 333-334, 496, 498-500, 508.

⁶ *Races, Nations and Classes*, 1924, Ch. II.

vertical cleavage, acting largely independently of each other and with little contact between the members of the distinct groups. But nationality and racial groups embedded in other nationality groups and without political independence ordinarily become horizontal groups. If the minority group is immigrant in character it becomes a lower cultural, economic, and political stratum in the society to which it is attached. If it is a conquering group it is the upper stratum of the reorganized society. The Chicago school of sociologists has done much in the way of analysis of direct contact groups such as the ghetto,⁷ and of horizontal groups.⁸ They have also studied criminal and delinquent groups to advantage.⁹ All of these studies necessarily have to deal with nationality problems. Ross¹⁰ and E. D. Martin,¹¹ following the lead of Le Bon and Tarde, have helped to clarify the theory of the behavior of groups and publics, especially as they influence public opinion, stimulate revolutions, and produce other social phenomena to which the international relations student must give his attention.

2. The close correlation of the attitudes of the group members with group constitution has been emphasized by Cooley.¹² The attitudes that develop in primary groups and in direct contact immigrant groups are highly emotional in character, even of the primary emotional type; while those developing in the more derivative and politically independent national groups tend to be more intellectual in character. The analysis of attitudes and even the application of the theory of attitudes to international situations has been largely developed by W. I. Thomas¹³ and H. A. Miller.¹⁴ Bernard has pointed out the correlative expansion and socialization of attitudes with the expansion of groups on the indirect contact level due to the ex-

⁷ Wirth, Louis, *The Ghetto*, 1928.

⁸ Zorbaugh, H. W., *The Gold Coast and the Slum*, 1929.

⁹ Thrasher, F. M., *The Gang*, 1927; Reckless, W. C., *Vice in Chicago*, 1933.

¹⁰ Ross, E. A., *Social Psychology*, 1908.

¹¹ *The Behavior of Crowds*, 1920.

¹³ *The Polish Peasant*, 1918-1921, and *The Unadjusted Girl*, 1923.

¹⁴ *Races, Nations and Classes*, Chs. IV-XVI.

pansion of economic organization.¹⁵ He has characterized these more derivative attitudes as ideals.¹⁶ Internationally speaking, they become national ideals or even ideals of internationalism.¹⁷ An understanding of the social psychology of attitudes is fundamental to the student of international relations who wishes to grasp the mechanics of the psycho-social trends of the larger groups and to control them. The sociologists have been quite active in the analysis of the influence of the press upon public opinion.¹⁸ Miller,¹⁹ Edwards,²⁰ and Sorokin²¹ have studied the relation of attitudes to revolution. Students and associates of W. I. Thomas have made a special study of attitudes following more or less closely the lead of Thomas himself in this field.²²

3. The concentration and integration of attitudes in the form of interests, both subjective and objective, were early studied by Ratzenhofer²³ and Gumplowicz,²⁴ two Austrian sociologists, by Tarde²⁵ in France, and by Small²⁶ and Ross²⁷ in the United States. The theory of interests is an older form of the analysis of attitudes which has largely given way to more recent types of attitudinal analysis. Thomas' theory of the wishes, adopted by the Chicago school and formerly much used by them,²⁸ and Sumner's theory of the subsistence interests or motives²⁹ are really modifications of the older theory of interests. Although the theory of interests was, from the standpoint of social psychology, a relatively crude tool, it was never-

¹⁵ *An Introduction to Social Psychology*, Ch. XXVII.

¹⁶ See Roosevelt, T. R., *American Ideals*, 1897.

¹⁷ See Stratton, G. M., *The Social Psychology of International Conduct*, 1929.

¹⁸ Park, R. E., *The Immigrant Press and Its Control*, 1922.

¹⁹ See *Races, Nations and Classes*, Ch. XI, pp. 28, 156.

²⁰ Edwards, L. P., *The Natural History of Revolution*, 1927.

²¹ Sorokin, P. A., *The Sociology of Revolution*, 1925.

²² *Social Attitudes*, 1931, ed. by Kimball Young.

²³ Ratzenhofer, G., *Wesen und Zweck der Politik*, 3 vols., 1893; *Die soziologische Erkenntnis*, 1898.

²⁴ Gumplowicz, Ludwig, *Grundriss der Soziologie*, 1885.

²⁵ Tarde, G., *Les transformations du pouvoir*, 1899.

²⁶ Small, A. W., *General Sociology*, 1905, Chs. XXVII, XXXI.

²⁷ *The Foundations of Sociology*, 1905, Ch. VII.

²⁸ Thomas, W. I., *The Unadjusted Girl*, 1923.

18-19.

theless a vast improvement upon earlier attempts at a naturalistic explanation of group relations, and especially of group conflicts and group cooperation or amalgamation, in terms of rational self-interest or of instinctive drives. It marked the entrance of the consideration of both tangible and intangible environmental factors working through ordinary and largely unconscious stimulus-response mechanisms into the theory of foreign and international relations. It was in fact the primary psycho-sociological foundation of the sociological theory of group or social conflict, and was, we believe, one of the factors that helped to divert the study of international relations from the study merely of legal documents, wars, treaties, arbitration commissions, and the like, to that of institutional and current social behavior processes.

4. The sociologists have been responsible primarily for the development of the theory of social conflict. Ratzenhofer,⁸⁰ Gumplowicz,⁸¹ Novicow,⁸² Tarde,⁸³ and Pareto⁸⁴ are the more outstanding early figures in the analysis of the factors basic to conflict and the processes and forms through which it operates. Small,⁸⁵ Sumner,⁸⁶ Keller,⁸⁷ Park⁸⁸ and the Chicago school generally have developed this theory in America. This school views social conflict in all its forms, including those of commercial and political rivalry and war, as purely naturalistic developments or social processes, and insists on dropping the highly intellectualistic and legalistic theories of conflict which have persisted in jurisprudence and the traditional science of politics until very recently. It is our opinion that one of the primary bases of the science of international relations on the side of conflict of nationality groups and of international

⁸⁰ *Op. cit.*

⁸¹ *Der Rassenkampf*, 1883.

⁸² Novicow, J., *Les Luittes entre sociétés humaines et leur phases successives*, 1893.

⁸³ *L'Opposition universelle*, 1897.

⁸⁴ Pareto, Vilfredo, *Traité de Sociologie*, 2 vols., 1917, II: 859, 902-904.

⁸⁵ *Op. cit.*, Chs. XII-XXIII.

⁸⁶ *Science of Society*, 1927-1928, Ch. XIV.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*; *Societal Evolution*, 1915, pp. 56-72, 121, 308-309.

⁸⁸ *An Introduction to the Science of Sociology*, 1920, Ch. IX.

interests must in the future rest definitely upon the sociological theory of social conflict, and especially upon this theory interpreted in terms of economic interests.³⁹

5. The sociologists, especially those of the Chicago school, have developed a correlative naturalistic theory of group relations which may be spoken of as accommodation and assimilation.⁴⁰ An early approach to one phase of this analysis was made by Durkheim.⁴¹ The sociologists have made extensive analyses of the factors and social processes involved in overcoming social conflicts of all types and of bringing about accommodation through a shifting of interests and attitudes, resulting in the modification of public opinion, preparatory to the ultimate assimilation of interests and of organizations. It seems very likely that such a naturalistic analysis of the social factors and processes involved in accommodation and assimilation will be found by the students of international relations to be much more helpful than the old juristic theories of adjustment by diplomacy and treaty in any constructive attempt at the redirection of international relations. The sociological analyses of accommodation and assimilation were worked out primarily in numerous studies of immigrant groups and their adjustment to new conditions, and a very large number of sociologists have contributed to the analysis.⁴²

6. Closely related, but of an earlier origin, is the sociological analysis of culture, formerly usually designated as social heritage. Sociology in the United States, which followed rather the Spencerian than the Comtean leadership, consisted through the eighties and nineties primarily of the study of primitive culture. The shift in the nineties and thereafter, under the influence of the statistical method, to the analysis and generalization of contemporaneous data, temporarily withdrew sociology from its emphasis upon the social heritage and drove it in

³⁹ See Williams, J. M., *Principles of Social Psychology*, 1922.

⁴⁰ See Park and Burgess, *Introduction to the Science of Sociology*, 1921, Chs. X-XI; Dawson and Gettys, *Introduction to Sociology*, 1928, Chs. XI-XIII.

⁴¹ *La Division du Travail Social*, 1893.

⁴² See Ch. III of this study.

the direction of a cross-section analysis of social relationships and collective behavior. The maturing of anthropology in recent decades beyond the earlier stages of physical anthropology (now largely taken over by medicine and education) and archaeology into that of sociological analysis has brought about a reidentification of anthropology and sociology, and has again stimulated the interest of sociology in culture. As a matter of fact, the chief contributors to the field of cultural analysis today are predominantly sociologists and include Sumner,⁴³ Keller,⁴⁴ Ogburn,⁴⁵ Chapin,⁴⁶ Ellwood,⁴⁷ Case,⁴⁸ Willey,⁴⁹ Folsom,⁵⁰ Davie,⁵¹ Bernard,⁵² and Winston.⁵³ To these must be added the names of such social anthropologists as Wissler,⁵⁴ Lowie,⁵⁵ Wallis⁵⁶ (also a sociologist, professionally speaking), Radin,⁵⁷ Goldenweiser,⁵⁸ Boas,⁵⁹ and Kroeber.⁶⁰ The significance of the concept of culture for international relations lies, first, in the naturalistic attitude implied by it as a basis for the interpretation of the attitudes, traditions, institutions, and mores held by peoples largely as social heritages rather than as purposively constructed juridical and political institutions; and, second, in the understanding of cultural change, which is of the greatest significance for students of international relationships. Most problems of international, as of other group relationships, must be conceived as primarily the result of cultural changes which have made readjustments be-

⁴³ E. g., *Folkways*, 1906.

⁴⁴ *Societal Evolution*, 2d ed., 1932.

⁴⁵ *Social Change*, 1922.

⁴⁶ Chapin, F. S., *Cultural Change*, 1928.

⁴⁷ *Cultural Evolution*, 1927.

⁴⁸ *Social Process and Human Progress*, 1931.

⁴⁹ Willey, M. M. and Wallis, W. D., *Readings in Sociology*, 1930; also articles.

⁵⁰ Folsom, J. K., *Culture and Social Progress*, 1928.

⁵¹ Davie, M. R., *The Evolution of War*, 1929.

⁵² See citations below in this chapter.

⁵³ Winston, Sanford, *Culture and Human Behavior*, 1933.

⁵⁴ Wissler, Clark, *Man and Culture*, 1922; *Social Anthropology*, 1929.

⁵⁵ Lowie, R. H., *Primitive Society*, 1920.

⁵⁶ *Culture and Progress*, 1930.

⁵⁷ Radin, Paul, *Social Anthropology*, 1932.

⁵⁸ Goldenweiser, A. A., *Early Civilisation*, 1922.

⁵⁹ Boas, Franz, *The Mind of Primitive Man*, 1911.

⁶⁰ Kroeber, A. L., *Anthropology*, 1923.

tween groups and within groups necessary. Therefore, in order to understand fundamentally these problems of group relationships, it is necessary to get at a naturalistic analysis of the factors and the processes basic to cultural change. Most of the sociologists who have dealt with culture systematically have approached it from the standpoint of change or evolution,⁶¹ and some of these have been interested particularly in tracing culture back to its environmental antecedents and in getting back to the factors basic to change.⁶² The anthropologists have usually been content to classify culture and ignore the underlying causes of cultural change.

7. The sociologists have also been most active in the criticism of the old hypotheses of major inherent race differences on the mental, moral, and social side. While the anthropologists still adhered almost without exception to the theories of Gobineau,⁶³ leading sociologists, represented especially by such scholars as Ross,⁶⁴ Cooley,⁶⁵ W. I. Thomas,⁶⁶ and L. F. Ward⁶⁷ were actively demonstrating that distinctions between races on the social side are cultural and not biological or hereditary. All of these men did their work before Boas,⁶⁸ the leader of the anthropologists in taking the new view of race in this country, had formulated his views for publication. Ward's *Applied Sociology* is still a standard discussion of the relative importance of heredity and environment or culture in determining superiority of talent. The sociologists also gave the impulse to and led in the work of demolishing the instinct hypothesis which still proves a snare to the interpretative work of so many social scientists and historians. The necessity of dealing directly with environmental factors early led the sociologists to

⁶¹ See, e. g., the works of Ogburn, Chapin, and Case, cited above.

⁶² See particularly the writings of Sumner, Keller, Davie, and Bernard, cited above.

⁶³ Gobineau, Arthur de, *The Inequality of Human Races*, 1854.

⁶⁴ *Foundations of Sociology*, 1905, Ch. X.

⁶⁵ Cooley, C. H., "Genius, Fame, and the Comparison of Races," *Annals Amer. Acad. Polit. and Soc. Sci.*, IX: pp. 1-42 (May, 1897).

⁶⁶ *Sex and Society*, 1907, pp. 254-255, 258-290; also various articles.

⁶⁷ *Applied Sociology*, 1906, pp. 108-110.

⁶⁸ *Op. cit.*

suspect the excessive emphasis upon biological determinism then in vogue under the sanction of the theory of instinct dominance. The active attack upon the instinct theory, participated in by the psychologists, began in print about 1920, and the appearance of Bernard's investigation into the nature and misuse of the concept instinct⁶⁹ marks the culmination of the period of investigation and publication in this field. Some students of international relations still use the terms race and instinct as major explanatory concepts in dealing with their materials, but this practice is rapidly passing away among them.

8. With the obsolescence of the race and instinct concepts as social science categories, it was of course necessary to find other factors which would explain more accurately and satisfactorily the phenomena that had formerly been explained in terms of the biological categories. The sociologists had been working on this matter for some time. One line of descent for the sociologists is through the anthropogeographers, and another is through the philosophers of history. But sociology had abandoned the original laws and principles of both of these early schools before they led in securing the demise of the concepts of race and instinct. They had begun to investigate the incidence of environment upon human social behavior in a much more concrete and particularistic manner. Their major approach to these investigations was through the field of social psychology. The works of W. I. Thomas,⁷⁰ of E. B. Reuter,⁷¹ and of Cooley⁷² are typical of the sort of investigations the sociologists were making to show the dominant influence of the cultural environment in the production of personality characteristics and the traits of collectivities. Another group of social psychologists, the planes and currents school, to use an apt term of Professor Ross, were studying the functioning of

⁶⁹ *Instinct: A Study in Social Psychology*, 1924.

⁷⁰ *Sex and Society*, 1907; *The Polish Peasant*, 1918-21; *The Unadjusted Girl*, 1923, etc.

⁷¹ *The Mulasito*, 1918.

⁷² "Genius, Fame, and the Comparison of Races," *loc. cit.*, pp. 1-42.

the psycho-social environment in the large. Le Bon,⁷³ Tarde,⁷⁴ Sighele,⁷⁵ Ross,⁷⁶ and others were dealing with the processes of suggestion and imitation and the influence of propaganda and tradition and custom in the creation of public opinion, crowd action, and other forms of active social behavior. It is certain that these studies have influenced profoundly the work of the later students of international relations.

9. Although the sociologists were long busy studying the incidence of environment upon social or collective behavior, it was much later that they attempted to reformulate the old anthropogeographical concept of environment. In fact, they worked along for several years without attempting to define their concept of environment. The anthropologists, even of the social persuasion, stumble along even to this day with the older geographical and anthropogeographical notions of environment. They write and think for the most part of environment as purely physical and geographical.⁷⁷ As a consequence, they segregate culture as an entirely independent category *sui generis* and treat it as an underived factor in the determination of social behavior,⁷⁸ working through the process they call diffusion. For the functional sociologist the concept of an underived culture is as impossible as the old biological determinism. He has, therefore, sought a consistent account of environmental conditioning along two lines, which are supplementary rather than contradictory. One of these, known as human ecology, seeks to explain collective behavior as a process of coadaptive adjustment to the environment without attacking the more fundamental problem of the nature of the environment. The human ecologist studies migrations, successions of populations in areas and regions, as a function of their attempts at adaptation, concentrations of populations

⁷³ Le Bon, Gustave, *The Crowd*.

⁷⁴ *L'Opinion et la foule*, 1901; *Laws of Imitation*, 1903.

⁷⁵ *La Folla delinquente*, 2d ed., 1895.

⁷⁶ *Social Psychology*, 1908.

⁷⁷ See, e. g., Lowie, E. H., *Culture and Ethnology*, 1917, Ch. III, and Wallis, W. D., *An Introduction to Anthropology*, Ch. VII; also Wallis' article "Environmentalism" in *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*, V: 561-566.

⁷⁸ See Lowie, *Culture and Ethnology*, p. 66.

around natural resources and centers of exchange, accommodations, assimilation, conflict, and control. His field may be said to be somewhere between human or social geography and cultural sociology, and it impinges very closely upon certain aspects of international relations.⁷⁹ The other trend in sociology in this connection is to do what the human ecologists seem so far to have omitted—to attempt a systematic redefinition and reclassification of the environment in so far as it concerns the sociologist. The environmental classificationists reject the physical definition of environment of the geographers and the assumption of some sort of near mystical connection between the physical environment and human behavior apparently assumed by the anthropogeographers. Their object is to demonstrate the continuity between the natural and the cultural environments and to classify the environments functionally in such a way as to show the actual mechanics of the derivation of cultural behavior from environmental conditions through the psychological and cultural process of the conditioning of responses. Incidentally this functional classification of environment in terms of its derivation also takes account of the origin of culture and of its function in the determination of collective behavior.⁸⁰

10. These latter studies and reorientations in the study of cumulative behavior or culture, brought about by the sociologists, have had some influence upon the concepts of nationality, nationalism, patriotism, and other categories of international relations. Especially they have softened the legal aspects of these concepts into more largely cultural concepts, and have given an enlightening psycho-social interpretation of them, and especially of that of patriotism. Patriotism, from having once been regarded as an instinct, is now considered as primarily the product of education, tradition, and propa-

⁷⁹ See McKenzie, R. D., "The Scope of Human Ecology," *Pub. Amer. Sociol. Soc.*, XX: 141-154 (1926).

⁸⁰ Bernard, L. L., "Culture and Environment," *Social Forces*, VIII: 327-334; IX: 39-48; "Interdependence of Factors Basic to the Evolution of Culture," *Amer. J. Sociol.*, XXXII: 177-205 (Sept., 1926); *An Introduction to Social Psychology*, Ch. VI.

ganda.⁸¹ Likewise, few students of international relations would now venture to speak of a nationalistic instinct or to hazard the assertion that some peoples are inherently more patriotic, chauvinistic, etc., than other peoples. All of these traits and conditions are now referred back to environmental conditioning, and especially to the cultural environments, which condition them.

11. Another subject of primary importance for the student of international relations which has been investigated in some of its aspects more fully by sociologists than by the other social scientists is communication. Language, as a specific mechanism of communication, has been studied sociologically by sociologists,⁸² anthropologists,⁸³ and social psychologists⁸⁴ for several decades. Communication in its wider sociological aspects has also been studied, particularly by Cooley.⁸⁵ The organization of communication as an intersocietary process and the control of communication is being investigated by Burgess,⁸⁶ and Park,⁸⁷ and other sociologists. The effects of the new techniques of communication, such as the radio, movies, the press, have been particularly a subject of investigation by the sociologists, who have produced several monographs in this rather wide field.⁸⁸ These studies must have direct bearing upon those aspects of international relations which are concerned with the psycho-social responses of peoples to propaganda, misunderstandings, self-interest appeals, and like motivations.

⁸¹ Giddings, F. H., *Civilisation and Society*, 1932, pp. 363-367; Lumley, F. E., *The Propaganda Menace*, 1933, Ch. X.

⁸² See, e. g., Miller, H. A., *Races, Nations and Classes*, Ch. VI.

⁸³ Sapir, Edward, *Language: An Introduction to the Study of Speech*, 1921.

⁸⁴ See Bernard, L. L., *An Introduction to Social Psychology*, Ch. X; Young, K., *Social Psychology*, 1930, Ch. X.

⁸⁵ *Social Organisation*, Chs. VI-X.

⁸⁶ Burgess, E. W., "Communication," *Amer. J. Sociol.*, XXXIV: 117-129 (July, 1928), 1072-1080 (May, 1929); XXXV: 991-1001 (May, 1930).

⁸⁷ *The Immigrant Press and Its Control*.

⁸⁸ See, e. g., Mitchell, Alice M., *Children and Movies*, 1929; McAndrew, W., *The Motion Picture in Americanisation*, 1919; Forman, H. J., *Our Movie-Made Children*, 1933; Villard, O. G., *The Press Today*, 1932; Odegard, Peter, *The American Public Mind*, 1930, pp. 114-138, 198-238, 271-277.

12. Closely connected with the subject of communication is that of isolation, which has, internationally speaking, largely passed out of the category of a problem in geography and the technology of transportation and physical contacts into that of psycho-social relations. The language barrier is now much more important and effective than that of geography. The problem of overcoming language isolation is one that should be more thoroughly investigated, and it is apparently a sociological and a social psychological problem. Much more work has been done on the local than on the international aspects of this problem.⁸⁹ Already the rural sociologists have advanced far toward the solution of the problem of rural isolation, and the urban sociologists and social workers have made large contributions to the problem of breaking down the isolation of immigrant and other unadjusted groups in the cities. As yet there has been no particular professional or administrative stimulus (such as research funds, demands from councils, etc.) to undertake research in the problem of national or international isolation.

13. The problem of social control has challenged the sociologists from the beginning. Ross's volume⁹⁰ is still a standard work in the field, and it has been succeeded by numerous more specific and detailed studies.⁹¹ Latterly the political scientists, and particularly those of the political psychology school, have entered the field of the sociological analysis of social control.⁹² Recently also the Department of History at Columbia University has been applying sociological concepts to the analysis of nationalism.⁹³ The sociologists were in-

⁸⁹ See Bogardus, E. S., *Immigration and Race Attitudes*, 1928, and numerous studies in social distance by Bogardus and others published in *Sociology and Social Research* in recent years.

⁹⁰ *Social Control*, 1901.

⁹¹ See, e. g., Lumley, F. E., *Means of Social Control*, 1925.

⁹² See the works of Lasswell, Kent, Woody, Norman Angell, E. D. Martin and others in this field; also Neprash, J. A., *The Brookhart Campaigns in Iowa, 1920-1926*, 1932.

⁹³ See, e. g., Ergang, R. R., *Herder and the Foundations of German Nationalism*, 1931; Langsam, W. C., *The Napoleonic Wars and German Nationalism in Austria*, 1930; Megaro, Gaudeance, *Vittorio Alfieri, Forerunner of Italian Nationalism*, 1932; Van Deusen, G. G., *Sieyes: His Life and His Nationalism*, 1932.

duced to occupy this field of investigation because they found so many of their categories—such as custom, tradition, communication, mores, folkways, suggestion, propaganda—directly applicable to it. They have studied various aspects of the field. Sumner's work⁹⁴ is classic. The subject of social psychology is largely concerned with the field of social control. There are several monographs and bibliographies on propaganda, suggestion, custom, etc.⁹⁵ Advertising, the commercial phase of propaganda, has been studied more by the applied psychologists and business economists than by the sociologists, strictly speaking.

14. Leadership has also been largely studied by the sociologists and is now in process of active investigation, both by the sociologists and the political psychologists. Among the sociologists Bryan as a leader,⁹⁶ political leadership among the North American Indians,⁹⁷ the traits and conditions of leadership,⁹⁸ political leadership,⁹⁹ etc., have been studied. The political psychologists, especially of the Chicago school, are now very active in the study of leadership in political situations.¹⁰⁰ Cultural leadership, especially in connection with the influence of French culture upon Latin American culture and of French, German, English, and Scotch culture in North America, has been investigated in considerable detail.¹⁰¹ Although primarily a sociological subject, these particular types of cultural leadership have been studied frequently by people primarily interested in history and the modern languages, thus illustrat-

1906.

⁹⁴ Young, K. and Lawrence, R. D., *Bibliography on Censorship and Propaganda*, 1928; Lumley, F. E., *The Propaganda Menace*, 1933.

⁹⁵ Willey, M. M. and Rice, S. A., "William Jennings Bryan as a Social Force," *Jl. Social Forces*, II: 338-344 (March, 1924).

⁹⁶ Bernard, Jessie, "Political Leadership Among North American Indians," *Amer. Jl. Sociol.*, XXXIV: 296-315 (Sept., 1928).

⁹⁷ See, e. g., Bernard, L. L., *An Introduction to Social Psychology*, Chs. XXXIII-XXXIV; Bogardus, E. S., *Fundamentals of Social Psychology*, 1924, Chs. XXXII-XL; Young, K., *Social Psychology*, Ch. XV.

⁹⁸ Howard, G. E., "Ideals as a Factor in the Future Control of International Society," *Pub. Amer. Sociol. Soc.*, XII: 1-10 (1918).

⁹⁹ Laswell, H. D., *Psychopathology and Politics*, 1930; Merriam, C. E., *Four American Party Leaders*, 1926.

¹⁰⁰ See citations in Ch. III of this study.

ing again the interesting trend toward an expansion of some of these older social science disciplines in the direction of the use of sociological concepts, methods, and subject-matter.

15. The forms and conditions of social organization have also interested the sociologists from the beginning of their career as independent members of the scientific fraternity. Spencer treated sociology as the study of institutions, and various other sociologists have followed him in this viewpoint. Various sociologists have written on social institutions.¹⁰² Scarcely any sociologist has failed to include the study of social organization as one of the fundamental tasks of his science. Cooley's work in this field is still standard,¹⁰³ and has been used by political scientists and economists of the newer persuasions almost as extensively as by the sociologists themselves. It is perhaps in this field of social organization, and secondarily in that of social control, that sociology makes the most intimate and the most fruitful contacts with the other social sciences, and especially with political science and economics. The study of groups is a phase of the study of social organization. The sociologists have produced numerous monographs dealing with various phases and problems of social organization, especially those dealing with the family, the community, cooperative organizations, sects, parties, nationalist and immigrant groups, and the more ephemeral types of social organization dominated by fashions, fads, and crazes. Such works are too numerous to be listed here. The sociologists have also pointed out how social organizations or alignments, especially those of an economic, religious, and cultural character, cut across nationalistic barriers in this day of relatively easy communication and cultural diffusion. The sociology and social psychology of organization should be of particular use to the student of international relations.

16. The sociologists also have been long directly interested

¹⁰² See, e. g., Hertzler, J. O., *Social Institutions*, 1929; Ross, E. A., *Principles of Sociology*, 1920, Chs. XLIX-LV; Bernard, L. L., *An Introduction to Social Psychology*, Ch. XXXVI.

¹⁰³ *Social Organisation*, 1909.

in the subjects of war and peace. Spencer, Ratzenhofer, Gumpłowicz, Novicow, and Le Bon, as we have seen, among European sociologists, have given especial attention to these subjects. Sumner, Ross, Bushee, and Davie in this country have studied the causes and development of war.¹⁰⁴ Ross has written considerably on the psychology of war and also on the conditions of peace.¹⁰⁵ Several of the graduate theses in recent years list war or peace as the subject of investigation. The sociologists have concerned themselves with redefining war from a sociological and social welfare point of view in contradistinction to the old legal and political points of view and with finding naturalistic positive substitutes for war to supplement the more formal legalistic and negative substitutes, such as treaties, diplomacy, economic pressures.¹⁰⁶ The amount of writing in the fields of war and of peace by the sociologists has been considerable, and much of it has gone beyond the mere expression of opinion and propaganda. Here again sociology makes a fairly close connection with international relations.

¹⁰⁴ See, e. g., a clear treatment of this subject in Bushee, F. A., *Principles of Sociology*, 1923, Ch. X; also in Davie, M. R., *The Evolution of War*, Ch. VI.

¹⁰⁵ Ross, E. A., *Roads to Social Peace*, 1924.

¹⁰⁶ See, e. g., Addams, Jane, *Newer Ideals of Peace*, 1907, Ch. VIII; Barnes, H. E., in Duggan, S. F. (ed.), *The League of Nations*, 1919, p. 183; Bushee, F. A., *op. cit.*, p. 160; Finney, R. L., *Elementary Sociology*, 1923, p. 159.

CHAPTER VII

SOCIOLOGY COURSES IN THE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES DEALING WITH SUBJECT-MATTER OF SPECIFIC SIGNIFICANCE FOR THE STUDY OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

WE have collected in connection with other research activities in which we are engaged a very considerable body of information regarding the social science curricula of the colleges and universities of the United States, but it is not possible at the present time to digest and assemble it in such a manner as to give a complete presentation of the courses taught in sociology bearing directly and indirectly upon the subject of international relations. We shall, therefore, indicate merely the general trends in the teaching of sociology in the higher academic institutions with respect to the subject of international relations.

Since sociology was first integrated as an academic subject courses on immigration and immigration problems have frequently appeared in the curricula of our colleges and universities. Another subject not infrequently taught has been race relations, but more frequently with a domestic than with an international bearing. Courses stressing assimilation of alien or minority (usually immigrant) groups have also been given. At the University of Chicago, W. I. Thomas long taught a variety of courses on culture, dealing with primitive peoples, primitive social control, social attitudes in primitive societies, primitive institutions. Similar courses have been introduced into the sociology departments of a very large number of colleges and universities, with the result that probably one-third of the departments of sociology now offer one or more such courses. In some departments, such as that of the University of Washington (Seattle), courses on culture, dealing with contemporary foreign cultures, have been introduced. At Minne-

sota since 1907 courses on foreign "peoples" have been offered, much of the time in the department of sociology. In the sociology departments of divinity schools, and in the Bible courses and departments of denominational schools, a set of courses very frequently to be met with deal with foreign missions. Sometimes these courses are called the sociology of missions. Courses in population, when given in the departments of sociology, always have something bearing upon the international significance of population, with respect to density, numbers, distribution, etc. Migrations is the subject of another course that is becoming increasingly popular in university departments of sociology. Quite frequently the courses in social organization include a section on international organization and sometimes the courses on social control deal with the sociological processes or techniques of international control. Immigrant Backgrounds is another course that is being included in departments of sociology ever more frequently.

We know of only one course actually called International Sociology, although there are many courses that contain considerable portions of the subject-matter of this course. It is given in the Department of Bible at Bessie Tift College, Forsythe, Georgia, and it is taught by Lucius McLendon Polhill, an A.B. of Mercer University and later a graduate student at Yale University. The contents of the course are described as follows: "This course will be a study of the nations of the earth, the effect of foreign missions in other lands than our own, and a careful investigation of all interracial problems as they relate to American institutions, including the domestic life of our own people. The first term of this course will be given to studying the relationships between America and foreign nations, Americans in foreign lands, in industry, in education, and in missionary work. The second term will be given to a study of the relations existing between foreign nations, the effect of their national religions upon the religions of the world. In the spring term special attention will be given to foreigners

in America and the effect they will have, and are having, upon our government, our schools, and our churches.”

The subject of comparative religions, in some form or other—sometimes called *The Religions of the World*—is almost as frequently taught as courses on missions. Another course decidedly of international relations import is that of Social Conflict, as it is usually called, or the Sociology of Conflict, as it was called at Minnesota, when introduced there in 1919 by one of the writers of this report. A course on War was at one time taught at Yale. The social psychology of international relations is frequently discussed in courses on social psychology, and the subjects of nationalism and internationalism, race prejudice, racial and national isolation, the international relations of culture, international languages, and the international significance and relationships of language, and other similar subjects, are included in courses in sociology with great frequency, even when these subjects are not given the time and status of independent courses. Courses on social origins and social evolution also deal incidentally with international relations, although perhaps more frequently in connection with primitive than with advanced peoples. The effect of war upon national and international evolution is also a subject frequently included in certain types of courses in sociology, especially in those concerned with social evolution. In spite of the fact that sociology is concerned primarily with national and local processes, it has by no means ignored international relations, and would with proper stimulation go much farther in this direction.

CHAPTER VIII

POSSIBLE CONTRIBUTIONS OF SOCIOLOGY TO CO-OPERATIVE INVESTIGATION IN THE FIELD OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

It may be useful at this point to suggest concretely what contributions sociology might conceivably make to a cooperative study of international relations. This seems to be all the more desirable because the new international relations, as distinguished from the old international law, is so obviously a synthetic discipline—of more recent origin even than sociology—which draws its points of view and its subject matter, as well as its methods of procedure, from so many of the other social science disciplines. Some of the contributions that sociology might make to cooperative research in this field are as follows:

1. The attitudes of the peoples involved toward one another and the genesis of these attitudes psychologically and culturally. Public opinion of a national and international scope, while not an entirely new phenomenon, has developed greatly within the last century, and especially within the last few decades, in analytic depth, in scope, and in intensity. It is scarcely possible now to carry out any international program without a favorable public opinion. This fact explains the strenuous efforts of all the great nations during the last war to create by means of propaganda a strong devotion to the stated nationalistic aims of the war and at the same time to foster a strong hatred of the enemy. Public opinion making has become relatively easy in modern society because of the omnipresent and constantly active influence of newspapers, radio, movies, and daily and hourly conversational interchanges based upon these instruments of propaganda. The study and analysis of propaganda and public opinion making by means of these instruments falls within the field of sociology and

social psychology and is one of the chief contributions to be made by these subjects to the study and teaching of international relations. Where possible these studies of international and nationalistic attitudes should be made quantitatively.

2. The forms of organization of the peoples involved and the stage of development of their organizations, preparatory to an evaluation of the cultural status of the peoples and a comparison of their cultures. The increasing complexity of modern industrial and communicational life has brought about a corresponding complexity and variety of relationships in our society. These forms of social relationship are the expression, for the most part, of our multiplicity of functional social adjustments, which are in turn mainly vocational and professional, but also to some extent ideational, if not idealistic. These functional relationships of modern society tend to become standardized and stereotyped into more or less permanent group relationships. The number and complexity of modern organizations—most of which lie in a variety of economic, political, religious, moral, and cultural planes—greatly complicate the problem of social control and render it vastly more difficult. If this is true of national life it is much more the fact with regard to international relations. No two modern states find their group life and organization (including labor, political, family, religious, amusement, artistic, etc., groups) sufficiently similar and harmonious to render international cooperation easy, or even always feasible. Much less is the political student of international relations likely to be familiar with the internal situation of nations when stated in these terms. It is obviously necessary for him to turn to the sociologists for this information, since the study of such forms of social organization and functioning is necessarily a sociological problem. Such an analysis would indicate much with reference to what sort of legal or political or other institutional settlement or adjustment would be feasible or desirable for the peoples concerned.

3. The technique and processes of social control in vogue among the peoples concerned. Much would depend in any attempt to arrive at a domestic or an international adjustment with regard to economic, political, religious, or other social problems upon the types of social control in use and the attitudes of the peoples toward these controls. This also is a field for sociological study and recently has been much developed by the sociologists and the social psychologists with a primarily sociological interest. The increased use of propaganda in particular has challenged the attention of the sociologists, the social psychologists, and the political psychologists. These three groups work in close contact and in mutual understanding on the problem of propaganda. Since the time of the Great War international, as well as domestic, propaganda has become widespread and vastly important. At the present moment France is openly launching a barrage of international propaganda for the purpose of regaining some lost favor and prestige in the eyes of other peoples. Other countries follow the same policy. As yet the effective techniques and the conditions and limits of effectiveness of propaganda are not fully understood and call for much more analysis, both as a means of increasing the effectiveness of propaganda and of guarding against it; for its utilization has many similarities to gas warfare. But propaganda is only one of the modern methods of social control that have grown up in countries where the rise of popular social control has made it necessary to substitute more subtle controls for the formerly all-sufficient use of force and fear, if the special classes are to remain ruling classes. These special social controls are far too numerous even to be mentioned here, but they are none the less important in that they require careful sociological analysis if they are to be used effectively, politically or otherwise.¹

4. Leaders and leadership among the peoples concerned. Any sort of an adjustment depends very largely upon the

¹ See, e. g., Ross, E. A., *Social Control*, 1901; Lumley, F. E., *Means of Social Control*, 1925; *The Propaganda Menace*, 1933.

native leadership in use among the peoples. The personalities of the leaders, the techniques used, the ideals of the leaders and the motivations used by them in the control of the people are all highly pertinent to such a study. The subject of leadership, as a scientific problem for sociological analysis, is also quite recent in its development and has been studied primarily by the social psychologists with a sociological outlook and interest. Few subjects of investigation are more complicated, since the analysis of leadership is equally dependent upon the utilization of psychological and sociological data and processes of investigation. The personalities of leaders must be investigated and classified and the effectiveness of each type or combination of types in a multiplicity of social situations must further be analyzed and tabulated. Also the psycho-social causes of success in social type situations must be investigated and understood. None of this can be done effectively without a thorough understanding of types of social situations themselves and of all sorts of combinations of such social situations. These are preeminently problems which the political scientist cannot be expected to study first-hand scientifically. He must draw his information from other fields of social and psycho-social science if he is to have the data necessary for an intelligent study of political international relations. As a matter of fact, such dependence of the political scientist upon the sociologist and the social psychologist serves to show quite clearly that international relations is not a purely political subject, but has also its well marked sociological aspects.

5. The resources of leadership other than the leaders themselves. This problem includes the degree of education of the peoples, the mores of the people with reference to leadership, the channels through which leadership could and must be exercised, such as the press, radio, movies, the platform, pulpit, advertising, secret societies, cooperative or other occupational organizations, the schools and universities, and various other channels for propaganda and internal organization. All of

these problems, considered from the standpoint of investigation, are closely connected with those of social control.

6. An analysis of the various group and sentimental alignments of the peoples involved, either in conformity with or cutting across the lines of formal organization. These are usually along traditional cultural lines, of a religious or an economic character, sometimes becoming actively political upon maturation. These informal alignments are among some peoples more important for control purposes than the more formal and more visible ones. In fact, an accurate and just estimate of the character and strength of these largely intangible attitudes and adjustments is extremely difficult to arrive at. It involves an understanding of what was formerly called the soul of a people, or even the *Weltgeist*. It involves a subtle analysis of the spiritual elements of the culture of a people by the more refined techniques of social psychology. In the previous century such an analysis was undertaken by a number of German and French writers in particular, among whom perhaps the name of Taine stands out most prominently. But the modern analysis of the intangible elements of culture is cast along more realistic and somewhat less mystical lines. The social psychologist must combine his technique with the background and mass of data of the culture sociologist in order to get the best results. The literatures and fine arts of peoples must be studied analytically and appreciatively. The manners and customs, the conventions and beliefs, the moral and aesthetic motivations must be given objective symbolic representation. In fact, the social psychologist, the student of comparative literatures, the sociologist and the anthropologist must all be called into requisition to work with the political scientist in attacking this phase of the problem of international relations.

7. The beliefs and traditions of the peoples, even their largely unconscious mores, which in large measure—but not fully—correspond to their informal or formal alignments, are also very important. There may be several layers of beliefs

and traditions, not all of which get expression in obvious alignments, especially among peoples who have a highly complicated cultural history, due to invasions, changes of types of religions and governments, the evolution of culture by classes, etc. Not infrequently these intangibles must be unravelled before a definite grasp of the temper and of the potentialities of the people in international relationships can be adequately grasped. Such a study of the natives of India would probably have been of the greatest value to England in administering that territory. Equally important at least would have been a similar analysis by German scientists of their colonial cultures as a means of offsetting the rather brusque and unimaginative methods of her political colonial administrators. The close relationship between this and the preceding set of problems will be recognized readily.

8. The types of contacts and of communication of the peoples involved. These may involve personal, commercial, tourist, political, religious (missionary), journalistic, educational, artistic, scientific, cinematic, radio, etc., contacts. Such contacts have varying and extremely important effects upon international relations, as evidenced by our cultural, political, and economic relations with Latin America today. From personal observation we are convinced, for example, that the sending of international lawyers to Latin America after some new breach in relations has occurred is a great mistake. Roosevelt and Hoover were as much disturbing factors with the masses as Lindbergh was a healing factor. A disinterested university professor sent to South America to lecture on his specialty or students sent to study in their universities make friends in the only way friends can be made—personally and intimately—while paid propagandists sent down arouse suspicion. There are various other ways in which friendly communication and contacts between countries may be fostered; and the sociologist and the social psychologist are especially fitted for their study and formulation. International social science associations,

for example, bring leaders of social thought into close friendly and cooperative contacts across international boundaries. A number of inter-American child welfare, medical, psychiatric, sociological, etc., congresses have been held in various of the American countries and have had a marked influence in stimulating the investigation of common social problems. It is of the utmost importance, however, that these congresses should be in nowise official; otherwise they cannot escape the suspicion and the fact of making propaganda and of exercising political pressures. Better news service, devoid of the usual features of playing up the unpleasant and exceptional peculiarities of the peoples for sensational effect would help greatly. Already the sociologists have recognized the value of a careful study of the means and controls of international communication and have taken steps, as described in Chapter II of this monograph, to institute such an investigation. Unfortunately the main purposes of the study were sidetracked when it got out from under the control of the sociologists. *Social Science Abstracts*, a monthly bibliography and analysis of the most important investigations in the social sciences undertaken and carried through and published anywhere in the world, was another venture in a scientifically controlled understanding of world culture. This plan of publication was promoted by the sociologists and it received the cooperation of history and the other social sciences. Unfortunately it has been discontinued, after four years of very successful operation, because of lack of funds. These are only a few brief examples of the many attempts at study and promotion of better means and objects of international communication instituted and carried through by sociologists and other social scientists in recent decades.

9. Correlative with a study of contacts should be one of isolating factors. Not all of these factors arise from geography, but frequently, and generally in our day, from ill-advised journalism, diplomacy, and the wrong cultural contacts, from a lack of interest in the more imponderable cultural contacts men-

tioned above, or in the lack of machinery for carrying them into effect. We observed when in Argentina that the annual visits of very distinguished European university professors (under the auspices of university organizations of their fellow nationals in Buenos Aires) to lecture in Argentina had a vastly favorable effect upon the good feelings of the Argentine people toward these friendly nationalities. We heard there without charge lectures by such men as Glotz, the historian of ancient Greek culture, and Obermaier, the anthropologist. Such contacts as these do not break down commercial and political isolation alone, but also cultural isolation of other kinds. In the place of isolation a friendly understanding and mutual respect are promoted. Perhaps more important than distance in isolating peoples are language, religious, nationality, and racial barriers. These and other isolating factors have never been studied adequately and the political scientist and the political administrator have largely ignored them, or improperly discounted them. Beginnings of such analyses have been made, as was indicated in Chapter II, but there is need of funds for more intensive and more inclusive studies of isolating factors. Here is a rich field for the sociological investigator, especially in the fields of human ecology, demography, and social geography, and an important opportunity to provide information of great importance to the political scientist and the political administrator.

10. A comparison or contrast of the physico-social and bio-social environments, i. e., of the material and behavior cultures of the peoples. The stage of development of their arts (the use of machinery, the technique of commerce and of exchange, domestication of animals, militarism, etc.), has much influence upon the type of international adjustments peoples are able to make. The work of the sociologist in classifying the environments preparatory to an understanding analysis of culture relations and contacts has already been referred to.² It

² Bernard, L. L., *An Introduction to Social Psychology*, 1926, Ch. VI.

was the theory of Herbert Spencer and of his followers that peoples with a high degree of development of the arts, industry, and commerce—that is, peoples well advanced in their physico-social culture—would not be as prone to war as those less well developed in these respects. There is no definite research results available bearing on the correlation of physico-social and bio-social development and such matters as war and peace, international organization, migrations, communication and diffusion, and the like. However, there are some general observations that appear to be fairly reliable. It seems to be true, for example, that international communication and diffusion develop in some sort of positive ratio to the development of the mechanical arts on the one hand and to the increased complexity of social organization on the other hand. But at present we have only tentative generalizations covering these matters. We are also accustomed to believe that increased complexity of national organization tends to react positively upon international organization; and also that migration not only changes its character but increases its volume with the growth of the mechanic arts and of commercial enterprise. We are not sure how migration is affected by an increase in national and international organization. It is also evident that organization and the mechanic arts and processes go through certain stages of development during the history of a society, and these stages have been studied to some extent; but as yet no reliable results have been obtained to show whether migration is especially more facile in one stage than in another. However, more dependable results in this respect have been ascertained with respect to diffusion and communication; although such results are not quantitative. There is room for much further sociological analysis in respect to such basic problems as these. While the sociologist could not make such a survey entire, he should participate in it along with the economists, anthropologists, and social psychologists, and he should probably direct it.

SOCIOLOGY AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

11. The stage of development of the psycho-social and institutional environments of the people should be studied. Their traditions, customs, beliefs, means of communication, religion, economic and political development, their art and arts, and their non-material culture generally should be studied, not only for specific purposes as suggested above, but also as a collective unit, in order to determine their rank and value in civilization, and to estimate the possibilities of political and social reorganization and of the establishment of effective techniques of relationship with other civilizations or cultures. Great Britain and France have gone further in this direction of studying the civilization of peoples they have to deal with than we have. In particular, these countries as colonizers have subsidized the study of the less advanced peoples over whom they have exercised protectorates or spheres of influence. The most extensive anthropological and ethnological studies of primitive peoples in existence are the product of British scientists and perhaps may be regarded as a by-product of British imperialism. Whatever the motivation for these studies of the institutional and psycho-social life and behavior of these peoples, such knowledge in no small degree accounts for the unusual success of the English as colonizers and colonial administrators. It also tends to make the British tolerant of the religious views and traditional emotional attitudes of subject peoples. The Spanish were among the poorest of colonizers, because they were unable to take an objective relativistic attitude toward the institutions and mores of the primitive and barbarian peoples with whom they came in contact. Such surveys as those here indicated are necessarily the task of the ethnologist, the sociologist, and the social psychologist.

12. An analysis of the demography of the peoples involved, together with a study of sanitation, hygiene, and other matters bearing upon the growth, care of, and distribution of population. Such studies are now in active process in a number of countries of the world. Soon after the United States took over

Porto Rico and the Philippine Islands similar studies were made through the insular public health and educational departments. Similar work was later undertaken on the Panama Canal Zone. The Rockefeller Foundation has financed extensive studies of the kind here mentioned in China, in Ecuador, and in other parts of the world. The British have done somewhat similar work in India and in South Africa. More recently, missionary organizations have conceived it to be their duty to make health and hygiene and population surveys of the people among whom they expect to spread the gospels of the Christian religion. They are also beginning to make economic and social surveys, of both a general and a special character, as a basis for the understanding of the physical, economic, cultural, and spiritual needs of the peoples with whom they work. Within the last three years extensive studies, some of them on a national scale, have been made of various Asiatic peoples by American sociologists under the direction of religious bodies. Such studies as these cannot do otherwise than have a marked effect upon international relations—political, economic, religious, or otherwise—and thus in a considerable degree influence the policies of imperialism itself.

13. Special influences of the peoples upon one another, through such channels as migrations of the peoples, of culture, language and literary contacts. For example, France has had more influence culturally upon Latin America during the last century than has Spain. We had considerable influence in this quarter before the year nineteen hundred, but now we have less even than Germany. Both the volume and kinds of such influences and their causes should be ascertained. Sometimes institutions migrate to other peoples, when the contributing peoples themselves stay at home or move abroad but little.

The whole subject of the diffusion of culture is receiving much attention from both sociologists and culture anthropologists in our time and it seems safe to predict that the laws of diffusion will be worked out with a fair degree of accuracy

within a reasonable time. Of special importance in this connection is the study of culture carriers and of barriers to diffusion. These yet require considerable analysis. The close relationship of these research problems with those touching upon isolation and communication will be readily recognized.

14. The standard of living, with comparisons and contrasts of the real and nominal standards; also the factors affecting the standards. The standard of living has much to do with the possibilities of adjusting other culture standards and relations among peoples. Perhaps the strongest argument urged against unrestricted immigration is that of the lower competitive standard of living of foreign peoples. This argument is also made in defense of protective tariffs for the United States. In this connection, not only the material elements of the standard of living—food, shelter, and clothing—but also the non-material elements—health protection, education, recreational and cultural contacts, and savings—are important and should be considered. Differences in mores are also of great importance in working out a policy of international relations and should be studied carefully as a preliminary. All of these sociological problems are, of course, closely related.

15. The spatial distribution of population centers and their social and cultural and economic hinterlands. Such a study would involve the contribution of the geographer and the economist as well as of the sociologist (human ecologist). For example, one does not know Peru until he understands the three regions of Peru, which are not merely geographical and economic, but are also cultural and social. The same is true of the relationship between the metropolitan centers on the coast of South American countries—such as Buenos Aires, Montevideo, and Rio de Janeiro—to their hinterlands. These hinterlands are from 100 to 300 years behind the “porteño” cities with their close cultural contacts with Europe and America. Similar problems exist for study with respect to Australia, Asia, and Africa. Many other problems in the sociology of space

and time relations also await solution before a thoroughly authentic science of international relations can be organized. But perhaps enough has been said already to indicate the great importance of cooperative research in this field, to which all of the social sciences, including sociology, may make worth while contributions.

The recognition of the need for such data as are here indicated is not perhaps especially new, but in the past those who have dealt with international relations have depended largely upon journalists, travellers, and paid observers^{*} to secure the information desired. Usually these people have not been properly equipped by training, interest, and often by temperament to supply proper data and analyses. The journalist is in the habit of providing a human interest story. Most travellers have interests or prejudices which color their reports. Paid observers are likely to be somebody's mouthpieces. In all such cases the observations and reports are likely to be hastily and superficially made and they can hardly be considered dependable as a basis for the determination of national and international policies. Data of the kind here indicated should be the result of profound and careful study on the basis of tested scientific methods. Trained students of social conditions should make the analyses for such contributions. It has been our purpose here to point out some of those contributions which the sociologists might make in this connection.

^{*} The reader will recall the case of Woodrow Wilson's semi-secret observers in Mexico during his first administration, and other similar examples of this practice.

CHAPTER IX

SUMMARY OF THE RELATIONS OF SOCIOLOGY TO THE OTHER SOCIAL SCIENCE DISCIPLINES IN THE STUDY OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

SOCIOLOGISTS are interested in international relations as one form of intergroup relations. Since the nation and the state are forms of groups, and since the sociologist includes groups within his subject-matter, he gives some attention to these forms of groups and their relations. However, as has been indicated earlier in this monograph, he does not regard it as within his province to study those aspects of their organization and interrelations which are political, economic, or otherwise than sociological. Such studies as he does properly undertake, however, frequently bring him in contact with workers in the other social sciences. At times they are using the same subject-matter. At other times they are merely working in fields adjacent to one another. It may be worth while at this point to summarize briefly some of the functional relations that exist between sociologists and workers in the other social science fields as they bear upon the subject-matter of foreign and international relations.

1. Relations with History. Like the other social sciences, sociology is in constant need of historical data as a means to the interpretation of the origins of institutions, the evolution and transformation of groups and culture. History, although primarily political in subject-matter in the past, has always carried a large content indicative of the mores, public opinion, institutional types and origins, folkways, beliefs, and traditions. Such material is essential to the sociologist in his study of subjects touching upon international relations as well as of other types of social phenomena.

2. Relations with Economics. The sociologist recognizes economic factors as frequently basic in both the origin and the

transformation of culture and of social forms and controls generally. Consequently the contacts of sociology with economics are particularly close. The two subjects tend to merge in the investigations of certain types of questions that bear closely upon international relations, such as the study of the size and distribution of population, the relation of population to production, transportation, commerce, etc.; also in the study of standards and planes of living and international competition in these standards. Likewise in studying the social causes and effects of immigration the economic factors must take an important place. Modern war, especially as it derives from imperialistic policies, and the whole process of communication and diffusion, can be understood fully only by considering basic economic factors.

3. Relations with Political Science. Political relations are constantly limited or determined by economic and by various cultural factors, such as language, religion, the development of science and literature, of communication, propaganda, etc. Political science, as the work of Beard and Merriam and their followers shows conclusively, is constantly borrowing content and method from both economics and sociology. While this dependence of political science in the study of international relations is not yet as great in relation to sociology as it is with reference to economics, it will undoubtedly increase in the former instance. In domestic matters, such as party affairs and public opinion, the dependence of political science upon sociology is already very marked.

4. Relations with Anthropology. The newer developments in anthropology are definitely and directly in the direction of sociology. In fact, it now looks as if anthropology were destined to leave to medicine and education its traditional interest in physical anthropology, and as if archaeology would split off as a sub-science, perhaps still taught in the departments of anthropology, while the dominant interests of anthropology would develop into a new hybrid science, Cultural Sociology.

Perhaps it would be truer to the facts to say that anthropology, in its newer trends, would force one section of sociology back into the field of the study of culture which it occupied in this country in the eighteen-seventies and eighteen-eighties. Since anthropology has long been concerned with races in their physical and biological aspects, and is now becoming more interested in them in their social aspects, the relationship of sociology and anthropology in the study of international relations is immediately apparent.

5. Relations with International Law. The sociologist, as a student of custom and tradition, makes a definite contribution to the study of the origins of international law. Since international law as a science is paying increasingly more attention to public opinion, to the implications of the findings of other social sciences, and to all sorts of social pressures—tangible and intangible—it is being brought constantly into closer contemporary relationships with the science of sociology.

6. Relations with Social and Human Geography. It so happens that sociology shares with geography a considerable role of correlator among the social sciences and thus the two sciences, on their social sides, are frequently closely related. With the great expansion of contacts (including international relations) in the last hundred and fifty years, due in part to the improvement of the technique of transportation and communication, it has become necessary to find formulas or charts of orientation by which ideological and symbolical perspectives upon the larger world of contacts thus created can be obtained. Geography, by virtue of its charting of space relationships, has performed this office of correlation and integration on the physical side. On the abstract or non-material cultural side of diversity of beliefs, organizations, controls, customs, etc., the office of correlator has fallen largely to cultural and theoretical sociology. It is not strange, therefore, that in performing these two adjacent functions geography should have borrowed much cultural content from sociology, and that sociology

should have drawn heavily upon geography for its theory of environment and its theory of adaptation and succession, which it calls human ecology. Here again we have an excellent example of the rapprochement and constant overlapping of the social sciences in the present age.

7. Relations with Psychology. The relation here is largely through the new hybrid science of social psychology already referred to. The social psychologist can provide the student of international relations with materials on race traits, racial differences, race prejudice, nationalism, nationalistic attitudes, motives, and motivations, public opinion, etc. As we have already shown, this new content, contributed by social psychology, is not only indispensable to the study of international relations, but it constitutes a large and growing portion of its subject-matter. International relations, as a subject of research, is developing definitely and decidedly in the direction of social psychology.

8. Relations with Biology. The sociologists, as well as the student of international relations, is interested in the biological (dysgenic) and demographic results of war, the products of race mixture, the "struggle for existence," "social Darwinism," etc. The sociologists have been the keenest critics of the older largely gratuitous biological assumptions regarding human relations, race, etc. It is due to their efforts mainly that the myth of fixed racial types and traits has been exposed and eliminated from the field of international relations. For the race myth, and its assumption of fundamental biological differences among the races as a basis of race and nationality conflicts, sociology has substituted the theory of cultural differences and culture conflicts and has explained the origin and bases of these culture differences in terms of the conditioning of responses.

9. Relations with Social Work. Sociologists are brought into contact with the social workers in dealing with problems of immigrant adjustment, Americanization, war, and other

disaster relief of an international character. The work of the Red Cross and other similar agencies in war time, the development of missionary work in the direction of educational and social work, the extension of medical service and nursing to more primitive peoples in times of disaster, or in ordinary times of peace, the organization of flood and famine relief, etc., are a few examples of the growing body of international welfare work, which is constantly seeking an academic and sociological foundation.

10. Relations with Education. International education is in large measure a sociological problem, since it must make use of processes which have been studied chiefly by the sociologist and the social psychologist. The content taught in international education is also in part sociological. The exchange of university professors and students, the granting of international fellowships, and even the establishment of educational institutions by international foundations are practically always determined by social considerations and after sociological investigations relating to the needs for such action have been made.

INDEX

- Abbott, Edith, 36.
 Abbott, Grace, 37.
 Abel, Theodore, 16.
 Accommodation, 76.
 Adams, Romanzo, 16.
 Addams, Jane, 86.
 Adjustment, 80, 92.
 Alberdi, Juan B., 41.
 American imperialism studies, 17.
 Americanization, 18, 22, 26, 30, 37.
 Angell, Norman, 41, 42, 83.
 Angell, R. C., 35, 51-54, 56, 64-66, 68.
 Armies, 42.
 Assimilation, 20, 22, 26, 30, 33, 35, 76, 87.
 Associations, international, 96.
 Attitudes, concentration of, 74; group, 73, 76, 91, 95; integration of, 74.
 Bachman, John, 39.
 Balch, Emily G., 37.
 Baldwin, S. D., 39.
 Barnes, H. E., 9, 16, 17, 49, 55, 56, 57, 59, 62, 86.
 Baskerville, Beatrice C., 36.
 Beach, W. G., 44-53, 56, 67.
 Beard, Chas. A., 9, 106.
 Becker, Howard, 30, 32.
 Behavior, cumulative, 81; and culture, 80.
 Beliefs, 95.
 Bernard, Jessie, 7, 16, 84.
 Bernard, L. L., 7, 16, 17, 41, 45, 51, 62, 63, 71-74, 77-79, 81, 82, 84, 85, 98.
 Bernheimer, C. S., 36.
 Binder, R. M., 47, 63, 65.
 Biological categories, 77-79.
 Blackmar, F. W., 47, 53.
 Blegen, T. C., 36.
 Boas, Franz, 77, 78.
 Bogardus, E. S., 38, 39, 47, 49-51, 83, 84.
 Boody, Bertha M., 39.
 Breckinridge, Sophonisba P., 38.
 Brown, L. Guy, 39.
 Brunner, E., deS., 39.
 Bryan, W. J., 84.
 Burgess, E. W., 51, 59, 60, 63, 76, 82.
 Burgess, J. S., 16.
 Burgess, Thomas, 36.
 Bushee, F. A., 35, 47, 49, 50, 52, 54, 86.
 Business cycle, 33.
 Burns, Allen T., 38.
 Cabell, J. L., 39.
 Capek, Thomas, 36.
 Carpenter, Niles, 21, 39, 55.
 Carr, L. J., 35, 51-54, 56, 64-66, 68.
 Case, C. M., 52, 61, 63, 67, 77, 78.
 Chamberlain, Joseph P., 3.
 Chapin, F. S., 77, 78.
 Chicago school of sociologists, 73, 76.
 Claghorn, Kate H., 37, 38.
 Clark, F. E., 37.
 Clark, Jane P., 40.
 Colbert, B. J., 45.
 Colonization, 100.
 Communication, 22, 30, 82, 92, 96, 99.
 Complexity of society, 92.
 Comte, Auguste, 76.
 Control, social, 83.
 Cooley, C. H., 35, 51-54, 56, 64-66, 68, 71, 73, 78, 79, 82, 85.
 Coolidge, Mary Roberts, 85.
 Cooperative groups, 59.
 Courses of study, 87-89.
 Crowd behavior, 50, 85.
 Cultural, analysis, 76, 77; concepts, 81; conflict, 44, 47; expansion, 66; levels, 35; relations, 20, 22, 26, 30, 35.
 Culture, 15, 80, 87; and environment, 78, 79; foreign, 15, 18, 22, 28; and geography, 80; patterns, 67; primitive, 76, 77; stages, 45.
 Daniels, John, 38.
 Davie, M. R., 36, 44, 47, 49-53, 60, 77, 78, 86.
 Davies, G. R., 35, 45, 51.
 Davis, Jerome, 17, 21, 36, 56, 57, 59, 68.
 Davis, M. M., 36, 38.

- Davis, Philip, 38.
 Dawson, C. A., 52, 76.
 Dealey, J. Q., 51, 52, 54.
 Demographic studies, 101.
 Demography, 100.
 Deportation, 40.
 Devine, E. T., 35, 55.
 Diffusion, 22, 30, 53, 66, 101.
 Discipline, 53.
 Dissertations, graduate, 24.
 Dittmer, C. G., 21, 45.
 Douglas, Paul H., 8.
 Dow, G. S., 35.
 Drachler, Julius, 40.
 Duggan, S. F., 59, 86.
 Dunlap, Knight, 52, 67.
 Dunn, L. C., 22.
 Durkheim, Emile, 76.

 Economic research, National Bureau of, 33.
 Edwards, L. P., 50, 52, 53, 64, 68, 74.
 Ellwood, C. A., 16, 47, 51, 77.
 Environment, 79-81; and adjustment, 80; and anthropology, 80; and personality, 79; and society, 79.
 Environmental conditioning, 82; theory, 79, 80.
 Environments, bio-social, 98; classification of, 80, 81, 98-100; institutional, 100; physico-social, 98; psycho-social, 100.
 Ergang, R. R., 33.
 Eubank, E. E., 21.
 European sociology, 11.

 Fairchild, H. P., 35.
 Fairchild, Mildred, 17.
 Faust, A. B., 36.
 Ferrero, Guglielmo, 41.
 Fighting instinct, 50.
 Finney, R. L., 46, 61, 67, 68, 86.
 Foerster, R. F., 36.
 Folkways, 84.
 Folsom, J. K., 48, 51, 77.
 Ford, H. J., 36.
 Foreign missions, 88.
 Foreign relations, 24.

 Forman, H. J., 82.
 Fox, Paul, 36.

 Gamio, Manuel, 36.
 Garis, R. L., 36.
 Gault, R. H., 48.
 Gavit, John P., 38.
 Gee, Wilson, 7.
 Gettys, W. E., 52, 76.
 Giddings, F. H., 47, 59, 64, 72, 82.
 Gillin, J. L., 16, 44, 45, 47, 50, 53, 54, 58, 62.
 Gliddon, G. R., 38.
 Glotz, Gustave, 98.
 Gobineau, Arthur de, 78.
 Goldenweiser, A. A., 77.
 Group analysis, 71; attitudes, 73, 95; behavior, 85; relationships, 71, 95.
 Groups, 32, 59, 72, 85, 95.
 Groves, E. R., 50, 52, 54.
 Gulick, E. A., 36.
 Gumpлович, Ludwig, 11, 41, 74, 75, 86.

 Hall, P. F., 36.
 Hamilton, Walton H., 8.
 Hankins, F. H., 45, 51, 54, 59, 64, 66.
 Harmon Foundation, 17.
 Hart, Hornell, 48-52, 60, 65.
 Hayes, E. C., 49, 50, 51, 52, 59, 61, 67, 68.
 Hebrew antiquities, 7.
 Hecker, J. F., 16.
 Henderson, C. R., 16.
 Hertzler, J. O., 45, 49, 85.
 Hobson, John A., 8.
 Holcombe, A. N., 9.
 Holt, Hamilton, 37.
 Hoover, Herbert, 96.
 Hourwich, Isaac A., 37.
 Howard, G. E., 84.
 Human ecology, 80, 102.

 Immigrant attitudes, 33, 39; intelligence, 39; labor, 35.
 Immigrants, newer, 35; older, 35.
 Immigration, 18, 20, 26, 33, 87; Chinese, 34; commission (U. S.), 33; restriction, 34; and sentimentality, 36; and welfare, 34.

- Imperialism, 26, 30, 41, 44, 46, 55, 59, 63; American, 17; cultural, 47; economic, 42.
- Industrial revolution and complexity, 92, 99.
- Instinct, fighting, 50.
- Instinct hypothesis, 78, 79.
- Institutions, 85, 88, 100.
- International associations, 97; contacts, 96-97; isolation, 97; law, 91; news service, 97; organization, 30, 67, 68, 88; and peace, 65.
- Internationalism, 30, 65, 89.
- Isolation, 83.
- Janson, Florence E., 36.
- Jenks, J. W., 33, 35.
- Jenks, L. H., 17.
- Jerome, Harry, 33.
- Jingoism, 65.
- Jones, H. M., 36.
- Jones, T. J., 48, 50, 63.
- Joseph, Samuel, 36.
- Katz, Daniel, 39.
- Keller, A. G., 15, 48, 50, 59, 75, 77, 78.
- Kellor, Frances, 36.
- Kelsey, Carl, 45.
- Kent, F. R., 9, 83.
- Kingsbury, Susan M., 17.
- Kirkpatrick, Clifford, 39.
- Knight, M. M., 17.
- Kroeber, A. L., 77.
- Kulp, D. H., 45, 50, 62.
- Langsam, W. C., 83.
- Language, 82.
- Lasker, Bruno, 36, 39.
- Lasswell, H. D., 9, 48, 83, 84.
- Lauck, W. J., 35.
- Laughlin, H. H., 40.
- Laurence, R. D., 84.
- Leadership, 84, 93-95.
- League of Nations, 67.
- Le Bon, Gustave, 11, 41, 73, 80, 86.
- Leiserson, W. M., 38, 39.
- Letourneau, Chas., 11, 41.
- Lewis, E. R., 40.
- Lind, A. W., 39.
- Lindbergh, Chas. A., 96.
- Linton, Ralph, 22.
- Loria, Achille, 41.
- Lowie, R. H., 77, 80.
- Lumley, F. E., 47-49, 55, 64, 82-84, 93.
- Lundberg, G. A., 7.
- McAndrew, W., 82.
- McDougall, William, 50, 51.
- MacIver, R. M., 52, 56, 65, 68.
- McKenzie, R. D., 34, 36, 88, 81.
- MacLean, Annie Marion, 36.
- Mangold, G. B., 68.
- Marsh, Margaret A., 17.
- Martin, E. D., 73, 83.
- Mears, E. G., 36.
- Megara, Gaudence, 83.
- Merriam, C. E., 9, 84, 106.
- Method of social sciences, 9, 12, 39, 91 ff.
- Migration, 18, 26, 33, 45, 88, 99.
- Militarism, 21.
- Miller, Alice M., 82.
- Miller, H. A., 21, 38, 39, 60, 61, 63, 64, 68, 72-74, 82.
- Miller, K. D., 36.
- Millis, H. A., 36.
- Missions, foreign, 88.
- Mitchell, Alice M., 82.
- Munro, W. B., 9.
- Nationalism, 20, 22, 30, 44, 47, 65.
- Nationalistic patriotism, 64, 68.
- Nationality, 22, 30, 64.
- Natural Law, 7.
- Nearing, Scott, 17, 57.
- Negro, 38.
- Neprash, J. A., 83.
- Non-resistance, 42.
- Nott, J. C., 38.
- Novicow, Jacques, 11, 41, 75, 86.
- Obermaier, Hugo, 98.
- Odegard, Peter, 82.
- Ogburn, W. F., 16, 77, 78.
- Owens, A. A., 38.
- Panunzio, C. M., 37.
- Pareto, Vilfredo, 75.

- Park, R. E., 15, 16, 34, 38, 39, 51, 59, 60, 63, 74-76, 82.
 Parmelee, Maurice, 47, 58.
 Patriots, 65.
 Patriotism, 64, 81.
 Patten, Simon N., 8.
 Peace, 52, 86; aids to, 57 ff.; conditions of, 61; nature of, 59, 60; not permanent, 60; program, 62; technology of, 59.
 Peoples, 15, 18, 32.
 Perry, A. L., 7.
 Peters, C. C., 61, 62.
 Pigou, A. C., 8.
 Polhill, Lucius McLendon, 88.
 Population, 30, 44, 45, 88, 102; spatial distribution of, 102.
 Pound, Roscoe, 9.
 Price, M. T., 16, 17.
 Propaganda, 20, 34, 36, 48, 62, 64, 91, 92.
 Public opinion, 59, 76, 91.
 Race, 78, 79.
 Race differences, 78.
 Race propaganda, 64.
 Race relations, 18, 26, 30, 38, 56, 87.
 Radin, Paul, 77.
 Ratzenhofer, Gustav, 11, 74, 75, 86.
 Ravitch, Jessie, 21.
 Reckless, W. C., 73.
 Reinhardt, J. M., 35, 45, 51.
 Relations of the social sciences, 105-109.
 Research, cooperative, 91 ff., 105-109.
 Reuter, E. B., 22, 79.
 Rice, S. A., 84.
 Roberts, Peter, 36, 38.
 Robinson, J. H., 9.
 Rockefeller Foundation, 101.
 Roosevelt, F. D., 96.
 Roosevelt, Theodore, 74.
 Rose, P. M., 36.
 Ross, E. A., 15, 16, 21, 35, 36, 45, 48, 51, 53-56, 58, 66, 73, 74, 78-80, 83, 85, 86, 93.
 Sapir, Edward, 82.
 Seward, G. F., 35.
 Sharlip, William, 38.
 Shotwell, J. T., 9.
 Sighele, Scipio, 80.
 Simmel, Georg, 59.
 Small, Albion W., 74, 75.
 Smith, Richmond Mayo, 33.
 Smith, W. C., 16.
 Smith, W. R., 47, 51, 55, 62, 65, 66.
 Smyth, Thomas, 39.
 Snedden, David, 53, 68.
 Social alignments, 95; attitudes, 73, 76, 91, 95; conflict, 75, 89; contacts, 92, 96, 99, 101; control, 83, 88, 93; environments, 80, 81, 98-100; organization, 85, 92, 95.
 Social control, 83, 88, 93.
 Social organization, 85, 92, 95.
 Social Science, 7.
 Social science, boundaries, 10; disciplines, 7, 105; investigations, 9, 12, 13, 28, 39, 91 ff., 103; relations, 105.
 Social Science Research Council, 3, 21.
 Sociological, analysis, 76; concepts, 71 ff.; interpretations, 71 ff.; method, 9, 12, 39, 76, 91 ff.; treatment of international relations, 3, 11; viewpoints, 71 ff.
 Sociologist, work of, 3.
 Sociology, and anthropology, 76, 77, 106; and biology, 108; of conflict, 89; and economics, 105; and education, 109; and geography, 107; and history, 105; international, 88; international law, 107; international relations, 7; and political science, 106; and psychology, 108; and research, 13, 28; separateness of, 8; and specialization, 13; and social work, 108.
 Sorokin, P. A., 16, 53, 55, 74.
 Souders, D. A., 36.
 Speck, Peter A., 38.
 Spencer, Herbert, 41, 42, 60, 66, 76, 86, 99.
 Standards of living, 102.
 Stein, Ludwig, 11.
 Steiner, J. F., 36.
 Stella, Antonio, 36.
 Stephenson, G. M., 36.
 Stratton, G. M., 57, 74.
 Substitutes for war, 57.

- Sumner, W. G., 15, 43-45, 48, 50, 52, 53, 54, 59, 60, 72, 75, 77, 78, 84, 86.
- Sutherland, E. H., 35.
- Taft, Donald R., 21.
- Tarde, Gabriel, 73-75, 80.
- Tawney, R. H., 8.
- Thomas, W. L., 15, 39, 73, 74, 78, 79, 87.
- Thompson, Frank V., 38.
- Thompson, Robt. Ellis, 7.
- Thrasher, F. M., 73.
- Todd, A. J., 15.
- Tolerance, 62.
- Traditions, 95.
- Tucker, George, 33.
- Van Deusen, G. G., 83.
- Van Loon, Hendrick, 52.
- Van Vleck, W. C., 40.
- Veblen, T. B., 8, 46-49, 51, 52, 55, 57-60, 62, 65.
- Villard, O. G., 82.
- Walker, Francis A., 34.
- Wallis, W. D., 67, 77, 80.
- War, 20-22, 41, 86, 89; abolition of, 41, 52, 58; anachronistic, 41; benefits of, 53; and capitalism, 46; causes of, 44 ff.; and civilization, 41 ff., 54, 68; consequences, 54; a crime, 68; and discipline, 53; and display, 48; chief enemy of civilization, 68; a necessary evil, 54; and finance, 58; and human nature, 50; and imperialism, 46, 55; and industry, 41; and invention, 43, 53; irritants, 58; motivation of, 49, 58; outlawry of, 68; and race, 56; and natural selection, 48; and standard of living, 54; substitutes for, 57; and suggestion, 50; and woman, 50.
- Ward, Lester F., 42, 43, 45, 52, 78.
- Warne, F. J., 35.
- Weatherly, U. G., 15.
- Weltgeist, 95.
- Wessel, Bessie Bloom, 39.
- Whelpley, J. D., 36.
- Willeox, W. F., 21, 33.
- Willey, M. M., 77, 84.
- Williams, J. M., 46, 76.
- Wilson, Woodrow, 37, 103.
- Winston, Sanford, 66, 77.
- Wirth, Louis, 16, 73.
- Wissler, Clark, 77.
- Woody, Thomas, 83.
- Woolston, Howard, 17, 38.
- World consciousness, 66.
- World state, 66.
- Wright, Carroll D., 33.
- Young, Donald, 36.
- Young, Kimball, 22, 48, 66, 74, 82, 84.
- Young, Pauline V., 16.
- Xenides, J. P., 36.
- Zimmerman, C. C., 17, 55.
- Znaniecki, Florian, 39.
- Zorbaugh, H. W., 73.

WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY STUDIES

(NEW SERIES)

RECENT ISSUES

LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

- No. 1. A Byzantine Paraphrase of Onasander (O. P.) by Clarence G. Lowe
- No. 2. Faust and Faustus (Price, \$2.00) - - - - - by Otto Heller
(Dealing mainly with Goethe's relation to Marlowe)
- No. 3. Papers on Classical Subjects, in Memory of John Max Wulfling
(Price, \$1.00) Contents:
John Max Wulfling, The Man and Scholar - by George R. Throop
Canidia and Other Witches - - - - - by Eugene Tavenner
Restoration Coins - - - - - by Thomas S. Duncan
The Lex Data as a Source of Imperial Authority
by Donald McFayden
C. Sossius: His Coins, His Triumph, and His Temple of
Apollo - - - - - by Frederick W. Shipley
Concerning the Rostra of Julius Caesar - by Frederick W. Shipley
- No. 4. Agrippa's Building Activities in Rome (Price, \$1.25)
by Frederick W. Shipley
(This is the second paper by Professor Shipley in the series entitled:
The Chronology of the Building Operations in Rome from the death
of Caesar to the death of Augustus.)

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

- No. 1. The Mean Velocity of Flow of Water in Open Channels (Price,
\$1.00) - - - - - by Herbert R. Grummann
- No. 2. Ionization of Gases and Vapors by Ultra-violet Light (Price, 75c)
by Arthur Llewelyn Hughes
- No. 3. Oscillations of Compound Springs (Price, 50c)
by Alexander S. Langsdorf
- No. 4. Fire Hazards in Warm Air Ducts (Price, 75c)
by Alexander S. Langsdorf
- No. 5. Contributions in Geology (Price, \$1.00) Contents:
Pebble Wear on the Jarvis Island Beach - by Chester K. Wentworth
Pennsylvania Ostracoda from Hamilton County, Kansas
by David M. Delo
Minerals from Virginia Coastal Plain Terrace Formations
by E. Mitchell Gunnell and Wallace L. Wilgus
Rates of Wear of Common Minerals - - - by Arthur B. Cozzens
- No. 6. Contributions in Chemistry. Edited by Theodore R. Ball. (Price,
\$1.00) Contents:
The Electrodeposition of Alloys - - - - by Lawrence E. Stout
The Chemistry of Some Drugs Derived from Anthracene
by John H. Gardner
The Present Status of the Theories of Solution with Special
Reference to the Problem of the Solubility of Non-
Electrolytes - - - - - by H. Lee Ward
The Induced Reaction between Chromic and Hydriodic Acids
by Theodore R. Ball and Edgar H. Bohle

WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY STUDIES

(NEW SERIES)

RECENT ISSUES (Continued)

- No. 7. Contributions in Geology and Geography. Edited by Lewis F. Thomas (Price, \$1.50) Contents:
The Geographic Landscape of Metropolitan St. Louis
by Lewis F. Thomas
The Geologic Work of Ice Jams in Subarctic Rivers
by Chester K. Wentworth
The Opemiska Granitic Intrusive, Quebec - - - by Carl Tolman
Synonymy of the Mid-Devonian Rugose Corals of the Falls of
the Ohio - - - - - by Courtney Werner
No. 8. Criteria for Rejection of Observations (Price, 75c)
by Paul R. Rider

SOCIAL AND PHILOSOPHICAL SCIENCES

- No. 1. The Localization of Business Activities in Metropolitan St. Louis
(Price, \$2.00) - - - - - by Lewis F. Thomas
No. 2. Science and Humanism in University Education (Price, 50c)
by John D. E. S. Spaeth
No. 3. Three Philosophical Studies (Price, \$1.00) Contents:
Spinoza and Modern Thought - - - - by Lawson P. Chambers
Existence and Value - - - - - by George R. Dodson
The Realm of Necessity - - - - - by Charles E. Cory
No. 4. Sociology and the Study of International Relations (Price, \$1.25)
by Luther L. Bernard and Jessie Bernard
Annual Bibliography, 1931-1932 (Gratis on application)

FORTHCOMING ISSUES

LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

- No. 5. The Ioci of the Mensa Philosophica - - - - Thomas F. Dunn

Annual Bibliography, 1932-1933

Orders for any of these publications should be addressed to the Department of Serials and Documents, Library of Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.

